THE
SILVAE OF STATIUS

STRUCTURE AND THEME

BY

STEPHEN THOMAS NEWMYER

LUGDUNI BATAVORUM E. J. BRILL MCMLXXIX

ISBN 90 04 05849 4

Copyright 1979 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission from the publisher

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

To Martin D. Snyder,
with affection and gratitude

CONTENTS

Foreword ix

I. Introduction 1
II. Tradition and Originality in the *Silvae* 10
III. Structure in Ancient Poetic Collections 45
IV. Structural Principals of Individual Poems in the *Silvae* . 59
V. The Structure of the Books of the *Silvae* 122
VI. Conclusion 131

Select Bibliography 134

Indices 136

FOREWORD

This book is a revision of my doctoral dissertation submitted in 1976 at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. It seeks to provide a general study of the *Silvae* not limited solely to poems of one genre and to combat a number of long-standing but erroneous notions about Statius' poetry. In its earlier form the work profited from the stimulating criticism and occasional gentle prodding of my advisor, Professor Berthe M. Marti, to whom I express my warm thanks. In its present form the book has been rescued from numerous errors by the keen eye of my friend and colleague, Professor Martin D. Snyder who aided in the difficult task of proof-reading. To him I gratefully acknowledge my many debts. In all stages of the work on this book I enjoyed the encouragement and confidence of my wife Cathy, to whom my debts are too numerous to acknowledge.

Duquesne University
Pittsburgh

Christmas, 1978

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

In 1932, Paul Friedländer wrote, with only slight exaggeration, that Statius and his poetry lay buried in the graveyard of literary history.[1] In the decades since the appearance of Friedländer's article, a rebirth of interest in Latin poetry of the Silver Age, marked by a desire on the part of scholars to understand the complex of literary tendencies designated by the terms *imitatio* and *aemulatio* and the part played in this poetry by distortion and hyperbole, has given rise to sensitive and enthusiastic studies of the epics of the empire which have helped to rescue these works from the oblivion into which they had fallen.[2]

The *Silvae* of Statius, a collection of thirty-two occasional poems in five books, have not as a group participated in the renascence of interest which his *Thebaid* has enjoyed. Although the past half century has witnessed the appearance of numerous examinations of individual poems or groups of poems in the *Silvae*, no study exists which investigates all the poems in the collection from a single standpoint in an attempt to arrive at some knowledge of Statius' technique as an occasional poet.

The present study seeks to fill this need by a detailed examination of structure and theme in the *Silvae*. Analysis of all of the poems should provide an understanding of what general structural principles underlie the collection and of what themes most interested Statius the poet. Essential questions include: How does Statius build his poems from smaller structural units? How does the structure of the sections of poems resemble or differ from the structure of poems in the collection? How does Statius use such aids as imagery, metaphor, and myth in setting forth his main poetic themes? Finally, how does he construct his poetic books from individual poems? Moreover, a consideration of five themes carefully integrated into the poetic structures of the *Silvae*—the Emperor, the poet and his task, friendship, love of family, and peace and leisure—may provide some insight into the world view of Statius as it is presented in the *Silvae.*

---

[1] Paul Friedländer, "Statius an den Schlaf," *Antike* 8 (1932), 215, "Der römische Dichter Statius aus der Zeit des Titus und Domitian liegt mitsamt seinen Werken auf dem Friedhof der Literaturgeschichte begraben."

[2] Prominent among these studies are Willy Schetter, *Untersuchungen zur epischen Kunst des Statius* (Klassisch-Philologische Studien, 20), Wiesbaden, 1960; Michael von Albrecht, *Silius Italicus: Freiheit und Gebundenheit römischer Epik*, Amsterdam, 1964; David W. T. C. Vessey, *Statius and the Thebaid*, Cambridge, 1973; and Frederick M. Ahl, *Lucan: An Introduction* (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, 39), Ithaca, 1976.

A study of the structure and interrelations of individual poems of the *Silvae* based upon examination of all the poems in the collection should have several results. It may explain Statius' use of principles devised by earlier Greek and Roman poets in constructing their poetic collections, while showing in what respects Statius' favorite structural devices may be said to reflect artistic views of the Silver Age. Structural patterns which can be detected in a number of the *Silvae* of unlike genre may throw light on the problem of the influence of rhetoric upon Statius' poetic structures. The poet's use of specific devices may reflect his individual artistic aims rather than the prescriptions of handbooks. Examination of all the poems in the collection may in addition reveal thematic similarities and contrasts which exist between poems or books of the *Silvae* which could not be detected in an examination of selected poems.

A number of reasons may account for the relative neglect and scholarly disdain which have been the fate of the *Silvae.* Some critics have objected to the subject matter of the poems in the collection and to Statius' manner of treating his material. Yet the most important reason for the low opinion of critics which has kept the work from participating in the renewal of interest in post-Augustan poetry under way in recent years, is the characterization of the poems and of their manner of composition set forth by Statius himself in the *Silvae.*

The extravagant encomium found in some of the *Silvae* has rendered the work distasteful to many critics. Prominent in the collection are pieces which celebrate in praiseful terms the activities of Domitian and members of his court. H. E. Butler is harsh in his judgement of *Silvae* III. 4, for example, in which the eunuch Earinus, favorite of Domitian, offers up his tresses in Pergamum, "Without being definitely coarse, it succeeds in being one of the most disgusting productions in the whole range of literature. The emperor who can accept flattery of such a kind has certainly qualified for assassination." [3]

---

[3] H. E. Butler, *Post-Augustan Poetry from Seneca to Juvenal,* Oxford, 1909, 229.

The sometimes extraordinarily technical manner of treatment in other of the poems has earned them the disapproval of some critics. Martin Schanz and Carl Hosius write of Statius' technique in the poems which describe villas, baths, and roads, "Seine Beschreibungen sind minutiös technisch." [4] In their opinion, this quality renders these poems "... für Archäologen und Topographen interessanter als für Liebhaber der Poesie." [5]

The particular characterization which Statius attached to his manner of composing his *Silvae* [6] and his repeatedly expressed doubts as to their quality have most especially contributed to unfavorable scholarly judgements on the collection. A brief review of the ancient appearances of the word *silva* used as a literary term will ascertain the connotations of the term when used as the title of a work, and will show how the characterization which Statius attached to his work by that title has led to the common estimation of his *Silvae* as compositions of slight inspiration, slipshod workmanship, and hackneyed content.

Silva (ὕλη) early developed from its literal meaning "wood, forest" a cluster of metaphorical meanings to which "raw material" and "material of construction" are central. The metaphorical use of the word *silva* has a long and varied history in Latin literature and has its origins in the similar use of ὕλη among the Greeks. Ernout and Meillet define *silva* as a "... synonyme du gr. ὕλη, dont il a pris en partie les sens, notamment celui de 'matériaux de construction', et plus généralement de 'matière' (d'un ouvrage, d'un poème, etc.) ...; d'où *Silvae,* titre d'un ouvrage de Stace, proprement 'Matériaux' ...." [7]

The connection of the Latin term with its Greek antecedent is discussed in the *Origines* of Isidore of Seville. Isidore's work comes late in the tradition of the metaphorical employment of *silva,* but because the explanations in his encyclopedia are based upon prior learning and usage, we may cite him first in our discussion. In the book of the *Origines* entitled *de mundo et partibus* (XIII), Isidore defines, in the chapter *de elementis*, a number of terms used by Greek philosophers to characterize the uncombined first bodies of the universe. One of these terms is ὕλη, which, he explains, the Roman poets call *silva* because, in a literal sense, ὕλη, timber, is the stuff of *silvae*:

---

[4] Martin Schanz and Carl Hosius, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinian,* II, 4th edition, Munich, 1959, 540.

[5] *Ibid.,* 541.

[6] References to and quotations from the text of the *Silvae* in this book follow the edition of Johannes S. Phillimore, ed. *P. Papini Stati Silvae,* 2nd edition, Oxford, 1965. Deviations from the readings of Phillimore's text are noted.

[7] A. Ernout and A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Latine: Histoire des Mots,* 4th edition, Paris, 1967, *s.v. silva,* 626.

> Ὕλην Graeci rerum quandam primam materiam dicunt, nullo prorsus modo formatam, sed omnium corporalium formarum capacem, ex qua visibilia haec elementa formata sunt; unde ex eius derivatione vocabulum acceperunt. Hanc Latini materiam appellaverunt, ideo quia omne informe, unde aliquid faciendum est, semper materia nuncupatur. Proinde et eam poetae silvam nominaverunt, nec incongrue, quia materia silvarum sunt. (XIII. 3. 1)

According to Isidore's account, the philosophers used ὕλη to refer to the unformed raw material of matter and the Roman poets Latinized the word.

Cicero frequently used the term *silva* in his rhetorical treatises, regularly in the sense of a mass of disparate raw materials. In his early work *De Inventione*, he says that he will set forth in the beginning the material from which the various aspects of the concept of argumentation are drawn, *verumtamen non incommodum videtur quandam silvam atque materiam universam ante permixtim et confuse exponere omnium argumentationum* .... (I. 34). *De Oratore* contains several occurrences of the word in the sense of shapeless raw material. Discussing the abundance of material which may be taught eager students of rhetoric on such topics as word choice, word placement, and the construction of periods, Crassus remarks, *rerum est silva magna* (III. 93). Crassus instructs that, before one speaks, an abundance of raw material for subject matter must be gathered, *primum silva rerum comparanda est* (III. 103). Soon after, Crassus explains that the concept of duty comprises the entire subject of virtue and vice, *quae vero referuntur ad agendum, aut in officii disceptatione versantur—quo in genere quid rectum faciendumque sit quaeritur, cui loco omnis virtutum et vitiorum est silva subiecta* (III. 118). The subject matter of the concept of duty is all that which pertains to virtue and vice.

In *Orator*, Cicero writes that the richness of style and basic materials for the subject matter of oratory are derived from the disputations of Plato and other philosophers, *omnis enim ubertas et quasi silva dicendi ducta ab illis est* (*Orator* 12). In the preparation of a convincing speech, Cicero argues subsequently, a mass of material is available to the orator, *hoc in genere—nam quasi silvam vides—omnis eluceat oportet eloquentiae magnitudo* (*Orator* 139).

By a natural and easy extension of the metaphorical use of *silva* as "raw material of composition," the term came to mean a raw type of composition, unpolished in manner and disordered in content, and it is this sense which the word regularly carries in post-Ciceronian usage. Although Statius never defines what meaning he attaches to the title of his occasional collection, the extraordinarily wide variety of types of poems contained in the *Silvae* places the collection firmly within this tradition, and we may be certain that the poet included variety of subject matter in his understanding of the term.[8] Hugo Friedrich stresses the element of disorder and variety implicit in Statius' title, "Der Titel der Sammlung beruht auf der antiken Verwendung des Wortes 'Wald' (silva) für das Chaotische, Ungeformte, ungeordnet Mannigfaltige, im Gegensatz zum geordneten majestätischen Hain (nemus).[9]

Statius nowhere specifically refers to the miscellaneous nature of his *Silvae*, a characteristic of the work which must have influenced him in choosing this title for the work, but he again and again emphasizes that quality of his own *Silvae* which he most wishes to impress upon the mind of his reader. Repeatedly in the prose prefaces to the books of the *Silvae*, Statius assures the reader that his *Silvae* were composed at great speed. In the preface to Book I, Statius confides to his friend Arruntius Stella, the recipient of the book, that he fears that the collection, ordering, and publication of poems composed rapidly and already separately issued may cause the pieces to lose the only charm which they had, namely, their speed of composition, *sed apud ceteros necesse est multum illis pereat ex venia cum amiserint quam solam habuerunt gratiam celeritatis* (Praef. I. 12-14). He describes the poems as pieces dashed off in the sudden heat of inspiration, *libellos, qui mihi subito calore et quadam festinandi voluptate fluxerunt* (Praef. I. 3-4). None of the poems took more than two days to compose and some were produced in a day, *nullum enim ex illis biduo longius tractum, quaedam et in singulis*

---

[8] The types of poems contained in the *Silvae* are enumerated and classified in Chapter II.

[9] Hugo Friedrich, "Über die Silvae des Statius (insbesondere V, 4, Somnus) und die Frage des literarischen Manierismus," in *Wort und Text*: *Festschrift für Fritz Schalk*, Frankfurt, 1963, 44.

diebus effusa (Praef. I. 14-15). Statius claims to fear that the speed with which the poems were composed will be only too obvious to readers, *quam timeo ne verum istuc versus quoque ipsi de se probent!* (Praef. I. 15-16). In the preface to *Silvae* III, Statius notes that his friend Pollius, to whom the book is dedicated, has often been alarmed at the boldness of the poet's efforts in occasional verse, *libellorum istorum temeritatem* (Praef. III. 4). But the poet feels that he does not need to defend these works to his dear friend who knows the circumstances of their composition. The book can thus be offered to Pollius secure in the hope of a kind reception from him, *securus itaque tertius hic Silvarum nostrarum liber ad et mittitur* (Praef. III. 7-8). In the preface to Book IV, he explains his inclusion of more poems in that book than in the previous books of the *Silvae*, and attacks detractors who object to such poems, *quare ergo plura in quarto Silvarum quam in prioribus? ne se putent aliquid egisse qui reprehenderunt, ut audio, quod hoc stili genus edidissem* (Praef. IV. 25-27). In the preface to Book III, Pollius was said to fear an unfavorable reception for the *Silvae* because of their speed of composition. This speed, it would seem, is the quality which the detractors whom he mentions in the preface to Book IV are said to chide.

The Roman schools of rhetoric used the term *silva* to refer to a literary rough draft composed at great speed, which aligns their use of the term both to the most common post-Ciceronian meaning of an unpolished, disordered composition and to the characterization which Statius gives to his own *Silvae.* Writing at the time when Statius was engaged upon the composition of the *Silvae*, Quintilian, in his chapter devoted to the topic *quo modo scribendum sit* (X. 3), makes clear that he disapproves of the hasty composition characteristic of the literary *silva*:

> Diversum est huic eorum vitium qui primo decurrere per materiam stilo velocissimo volunt, et sequentes calorem atque impetum scribunt; hanc silvam vocant. Repetunt deinde et componunt quae effuderant; sed verba emendantur et numeri, manet in rebus temere congestis, quae fuit, levitas. (X. 3. 17)

A *silva*, in the sense in which Quintilian understands the term here, is thus a literary rough draft in prose or verse, composed at great speed. The rhetorician objects both to the rapidity with which such a draft is initially produced and to the superficiality, necessitated by this speed of composition, which remains even after the writer has revised his initial outpourings. His central complaint is directed against rapidity of composition, the very trait which Statius emphasizes in the characterization of his own *Silvae* and which was a source of pride to him, if we may judge from his use of *festinandi voluptas* (Praef. I. 3-4) to describe the feeling which their composition occasioned in him. There could have been little sympathy between Quintilian and Statius on the virtues of this type of composition, and it is possible that Statius, in the preface to *Silvae* IV, includes Quintilian among those who find fault with his *Silvae.*

Aulus Gellius and Suetonius apply the term *silva* to a composition of varied content without reference to its manner of composition or to the form in which the work is cast. Gellius says that he does not seek to rival the clever appellations which other writers have found for their works of miscellaneous subject matter, *Nam quia variam et miscellam et quasi confusaneam doctrinam conquisiverant, eo titulos quoque ad eam sententiam exquisitissimos indiderunt. Nam alii Musarum inscripserunt, alii Silvarum, ille* Πέπλον, *hic* ’Αμαλθείας Κέρας, *alius* Κηρία, *partim* Λειμῶνας *quidam Lectionis Suae, alius Antiquarum Lectionum atque alius* ’Ανθηρῶν *et item alius* Εὑρημάτων . . . . (Praef. 5-6). In his work *De Grammaticis,* Suetonius quotes from a letter of Lucius Ateius Philologus to Laelius Hermas, *Hylan nostram aliis memento commendare, quam omnis generis coegimus, octingentos libros* (*De Grammaticis* 10). *Hylan* is a transliteration of ὕλη, the Greek term for the literary type called *silva* in Latin, and Philologus' use of the clause *quam omnis generis coegimus* indicates that he, like Gellius, understands the word to refer to a work of varied content. Later in *De Grammaticis,* Suetonius reports that Marcus Valerius Probus of Berytus wrote a *Silvam Observationum Sermonis Antiqui* (*De Grammaticis* 24). Since Suetonius is speaking here of Probus' work as a scholar, he clearly has in mind a work of varied content rather than one of speedy composition.

Generations of scholars, familiar with the strictures voiced by Augustan poets against rapid composition,[10] have quite naturally looked disapprovingly upon poems whose alleged speed of composition seemed a matter of pride to their author. Statius' repeated emphasis upon the speed with which the poems were written, and the likelihood of unfavorable criticism leveled against the *Silvae* in the poet's lifetime, have caused critics to overlook the possibility that Statius' claims of hasty workmanship may be a reflection of a commonplace prevalent in Roman poetry whereby an author makes light of the effort which he has put into his compositions and accordingly minimizes their value.[11] Critics of the *Silvae* have not questioned Statius' claims about the speed at which the poems were composed, for they professed to see nothing in them to make them doubt the truth of his statements. These scholars who took Statius at his word were agreed that it was the poet's extensive training in rhetoric which allowed him to execute poems of considerable length in two days. The textbooks of rhetoric, they argued, provided Statius with a vocabulary and storehouse of ideas so colorless that they could be used again and again as occasion demanded.[12] The

---

[10] One recalls, for instance, that Horace complains that Lucilius, whom he describes as *piger scribendi ferre laborem* (*Satires* I. 4. 12), would write two hundred verses in an hour while standing on one foot (*Satires* I. 4. 9-13). Horace assures his readers that, were Lucilius alive in his time, he would gnaw his nails to the quick in the difficult process of composition (*Satires* I. 10. 67-71). He bids the Pisones to scorn a poem which was not improved by

---

many erasures (*Ars Poetica* 291-294), and recommends in poetic composition the liberal use of the file for polishing, *limae labor* (291). Vergil recounted that he licked his verses into shape as a bear does her cubs (*Vita Donati* 21 and Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* XVII. 10. 2).

[11] Examples of this commonplace are numerous. Catullus dedicates his new book of verse to Nepos because he was wont to think highly of the poet's trifles, *namque tu solebas / meas esse aliquid putare nugas* (I. 4-5). Horace explains the fact that he does not give public readings from his works on the grounds that he does not wish to make too much of such trifles, *spissis indigna theatris / scripta pudet recitare et nugis addere pondus* (*Epistles* I. 19. 41-42). It seems to have been a commonplace among writers of satire to depreciate their work as lacking in true poetic value. In his *Satires*, Horace claims that he does not consider satire to be fine poetry but a type of composition rather close to prose, *sermoni propriora* (*Satires* I. 4. 39-42). Lucilius (1279 Marx) characterizes his poetic works as a *schedium*, or extemporaneous production. The younger Pliny answers an inquiry by Pontius Allifanus on how Pliny, a man of gravity, could take up the composition of hendecasyllables by claiming to have had an inclination toward verse writing since youth. He then gives a sample of thirteen hexameters which, he says, he dashed off in no time (*exiguo temporis momento . . . exaravi*, *Epistles* VII. 4. 5). Perhaps the most interesting example of alleged effortlessness in poetic composition is Ovid's account (*Tristia* IV. 10. 25-26) of how he "lisped in numbers:"

> sponte sua carmen numeros veniebat ad aptos
> et quod temptabam dicere versus erat.

[12] The judgment of Otto Ribbeck, *Geschichte der römischen Dichtung*, 3 volumes, Stuttgart, 1887-1892, 3, 215, is typical of this attitude toward the *Silvae*, "Die Schnelligkeit der Herstellung schloss besondere Tiefe der Studien und sorgfältigere Durcharbeitung des Stoffes aus. In einem

purpose of this study is to discover whether, on closer examination than Statius' critics have been willing to grant the works which they condemn, the *Silvae* prove to be mere versified rhetorical τόποι, or works behind whose pretense of hasty composition, perhaps not meant to be taken seriously, lies careful workmanship.[13]

---

verhaltnismässig beschränkten Kreise von Wörtern, Wendungen, Bildern, die ihm ungesucht zu Gebote standen, bewegt sich der Verfasser. Es ist die gangbare kleine Münze aus der Schule der Poetik und Rhetorik, die er ohne Scheu vor Wiederholungen ausgibt. Auch das Gerüst seines Aufbaues stand ihm für verschiedene Fälle in den wesentlichen Bestandteilen fest, und zur Ausfüllung wurde ein gewisser Vorrat von Motiven und Ornamenten verwendet, doch wusste der geistreiche Kopf immerhin mit mannigfachen Variationen und hübschen individuellen Zügen das Schema anmutig und frisch zu beleben." Schanz and Hosius, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, II, 540, express similar belief in the literal truth of Statius' claims, "Es sind Gelegenheitsgedichte aus dem Augenblick geboren und hingeworfen." They are confident that Statius' training in rhetoric allowed such rapid composition, *ibid.*, "Durch den Unterricht in seines Vaters Schule und durch die eigene Betätigung hatte er die Fülle der Gemeinplätze eines poetischen Sprachschatzes und seine poetischen Bilder so in sich aufgenommen, dass sie ihm jederzeit zu Gebote standen." The same opinions are voiced by H. E. Butler, *Post-Augustan Poetry*, 227-228, and by Clarence W. Mendell, *Latin Poetry: The Age of Rhetoric and Satire*, Archon, 1967, 111.

[13] Few scholars have entertained the opinion that the *Silvae* are works of fastidious craftsmanship. One significant exception is Hugo Friedrich, "Über die Silvae des Statius," 46, who doubts whether improvisation can be claimed for any poem in the collection, "Von improvisierender Ungezwungenheit kann in der Tat nicht im entferntesten die Rede sein. Die *Silvae* sind eines der raffiniertesten Erzeugnisse der silbernen Latinität." Clarence W. Mendell, who otherwise expresses only contempt for Statius and his poetry, admits of *Silvae* I. 1 *Equs Maximus Domitiani Imp.*, in *Latin Poetry: The Age of Rhetoric and Satire*, 114, "The nicety of construction makes it hard to believe that this poem was really an improvisation." Rafaelle Argenio voices the same sentiment concerning *Silvae* II. 2 *Villa Surrentina Polli Felicis* in "La Villa Sorrentina di Pollio Felice (P. Papinii Statii *Silvarum* Liber II, 2), *RSC* 18 (1970), 194, "Dopo la lettura di questa Selva chi oserebbe affermare che essa fu veramente improvvisata, anche se Stazio si vanta di non averne composta nessuna in un tempo maggiore di due giorni?"

CHAPTER TWO

TRADITION AND ORIGINALITY IN THE *SILVAE*

The great majority of the poems in the *Silvae* and their relationship to other ancient poems composed in the genres represented in the collection, are unfamiliar even to many classical scholars. An overview of the contents of the *Silvae* will serve to classify the poems generically, to ascertain the debt of the collection to earlier works in the genres which the *Silvae* include, and to determine the poet's degree of originality in his handling of the genres in which he works. Statius' book of occasional verse is truly a *silva* in the sense in which Gellius and Suetonius employ the term. The work contains examples of a substantial number of what were by Statius' time distinct and well-established genres. The attempt to determine how far Statius' poems reflect the commonplaces ordinarily occurring in these genres and to what extent he has combined in the poems elements from several genres and introduced new elements into them, is complex. Still more difficult, but essential to a study of Statius' poetic structures, is the question of the poet's degree of indebtedness to the handbooks of rhetoric which offered prescriptions for the composition of many of the genres included in the *Silvae.*

The starting point for an understanding of the content and meaning of the *Silvae* is the prose prefaces which precede Books I-IV.[1] The use of prose prefatory epistles to poetic works was widespread in Roman imperial literature. Quintilian (VIII. 3. 31) says that Pomponius Secundus and Seneca the Younger discussed, in prefaces (*praefationibus*) to their tragedies, whether such an expression as *gradus eliminat* was appropriate to tragedy, and Martial prefaced his Books I, II, VIII, IX, and XII with prose epistles. It was not surprising, therefore, that Statius should prefix prose epistles to his books of occasional verse.

His prose prefaces follow a rather rigid format, which suggests that he regarded the preface primarily as a useful device for conveying information concerning the circumstances of composition of the individual poems, for indicating the contents of the books, for stating some apologetic remarks about public reaction to the *Silvae*, and, not least, for flattering the recipients of the books. An examination of selected sections of each preface will furnish a composite view of the prefaces to the *Silvae*.

---

[1] The letter which precedes *Silvae* V will be discussed in Chapter III, 49.

Coming at the head of the entire collection of *Silvae*, the preface to the first book naturally begins with some general observations on the collection as a whole in the form of a justification for poetry written in a somewhat relaxed style, *stilo remissiore* (Praef. I. 9-10).[2] Statius by implication compares himself to Vergil and Homer when he says that readers forgive them for their light productions, *sed et Culicem legimus et Batrachomachiam etiam agnoscimus; nec quisquam est illustrium poetarum qui non aliquid operibus suis stilo remissiore praeluserit* (Praef. I. 7-10).

As was the case with the preface to *Silvae* I, Statius introduces those to Books II-IV with a reference to the delight which he takes in the friendship that he shares with the recipient of the book, a pleasure which has prompted the dedication. There follows in each preface a request that the recipient lend his support to the book. In all the prefaces a sort of "table of contents," listing the poems in the order of their appearance in the book, follows the opening address to the recipient. Complimentary comments about the recipients of the poems are interspersed with information on the occasion of composition of the individual pieces. Of *Silvae* I. 1, for example, Statius explains that his work will take its beginning from the godlike Emperor, *primus libellus sacrosanctum habet testem: sumendum enim erat 'a Iove principium.' centum hos versus quos in ecum maximum feci, indulgentissimo imperatori postero die quam dedicaverat opus, tradere iussus sum* (Praef. I. 16-20). The largest part of each preface is devoted to a catalogue setting forth in careful detail the sequence of the poems in the separate books, and Statius takes pains to insure that the order that he has chosen for his poems will be noted by the reader. In the preface to *Silvae* IV he indicates the order precisely, *primo . . . secundo . . . tertio . . . proximum . . . iuncta est,* and so on (Praef. IV. 5-20). This emphasis on the order of the poems indicates that Statius arranged the books himself, wishing the poems to be read in a definite order and the books to be seen as carefully integrated units. The fact that the poet gathered together a number of his poems and placed them in a particular order over the span of several books suggests that he may have excluded some poems, now lost, from a place in the published collection, perhaps feeling them to be unrepresentative of his best work or somehow unsuited to stand beside the other poems in the order which he had determined for the pieces which were to be published. The *epistula de editione Thebaidos* which Statius mentions in the preface to *Silvae* IV (Praef. IV. 16-18) may have been such a poem rejected by Statius at the time he published Book IV.[3] Further evidence that the *Silvae* as they now stand do not include all of the occasional poems which Statius penned is provided by *Silvae* II. 1 *Glaucias Atedi Melioris Delicatus.* Speaking of his work as a composer of *consolationes,* the poet writes (*Silvae* II. 1. 30-34):

---

[2] The term *remissum* is used a number of times in Latin literature to describe both a relaxed or informal manner of conversation and a lighthearted manner of composition. Ovid (*Tristia* II. 547) begs his reader not to think all of his work is lighthearted (*ne tamen omne meum credas opus esse remissum*), for he has set greater sails upon his bark in composing the *Fasti*. The poet contrasts the light and frivolous with the grand and serious. Quintilian (XI. 164) employs the term to describe the relaxed style appropriate to digressions within speeches (*egressiones remissae*). The rhetorician here contrasts the serious manner of discourse suited to the main narrative and polemic portions of an oration with the lighter manner permissible in digressions. Suetonius (*Tiberius* 21) explains how Augustus would break off his freer manner of conversing (*remissiores hilariosque sermones*) when the dour Tiberius approached.

> me fulmine in ipso
> audivere patres; ego iuxta busta profusis
> matribus atque piis cecini solatia natis,—
> et mihi, cum proprios gemerem defectus ad ignis
> (quem, Natura!) patrem.

In none of the extant *Silvae* does Statius console a mother or a father on the death of a loved one.

---

[3] Tore Janson, *Latin Prose Prefaces: Studies in Literary Conventions* (Studia Latina Stockholmiensia, 13), Stockholm, 1964, 109, argues, on the basis of Statius' statement concerning this *epistula* in the preface to Book IV, *Maximum Vibium et dignitatis et eloquentiae nomine diligi satis eram testatus epistula quam ad illum de editione Thebaidos meae publicavi . . .* (Praef. IV. 16-18), that the *epistula* was a prose letter, since, he reasons, one would expect a verse letter to have been incorporated into the *Silvae.* Against Janson's position is the fact that Statius says that he celebrated in this letter the eloquence and friendship of Vibius Maximus. Praises of the accomplishment of his friends and the treatment of various aspects of the topic of friendship are two elements frequently found in the occasional verse of Statius and their treatment as the theme of an *epistula* would seem rather to suggest that the letter was written in verse. That Statius did practice the verse epistle is shown by *Silvae* IV. 4 *Epistula ad Vitorium Marcellum.*

In the manuscripts, the preface to *Silvae* I breaks off before the completion of the catalogue of poems in the book, but the poet's practice in the prefaces to Books II-IV makes it probable that he ended the preface to Book I, as he did those to II-IV, with a plea that the recipient use his influence to protect the poet from the hostile criticism which might greet the *Silvae*. Each preface ends as it had begun with a request for the protection of the recipient. The preface to *Silvae* I differs from this pattern only in that it opens with general remarks bearing upon the publication of the collected *Silvae* and at the end lacks, because of the unfinished state of the epistle in our manuscripts, any reference to the recipient.

Certain elements which figure prominently in Statius' prefaces are τόποι of the genre. Zoja Pavlovskis, in her history of prose prefaces to poetic collections, feels that the poet's requests for approbation or censure on his productions are not seriously intended, but are merely manifestations of "... a set code of politeness which ... for centuries continued to impose on poets the rule of stating in one way or another, that their friends were better judges of poetry than the authors themselves." [4] A corollary to this flattery is the frequently expressed request that the friends use their influence to assure a favorable reception for the poet's work. A third commonplace of the preface is a defense of the genre employed in the work, with an appeal to *exempla*.[5] Statius cites Vergil and Homer as examples of poets who relaxed in lighter verse forms.

Despite the prominence of commonplace features in Statius' prose prefaces, a number of his own attitudes can be deduced from what is said and left unsaid in the prefaces. We noted above the poet's emphasis on the speed of composition of the *Silvae* and his fear that their hasty workmanship may be only too obvious to the reader [6] and may not represent the actual facts of composition. Yet Statius' description of his *Silvae* as poems which flowed from him in the sudden heat and joy of virtuosity, *qui mihi subito calore et quadam festinandi voluptate fluxerunt* (Praef. I. 3-4), suggests that he is in fact anything but ashamed of his ability. Zoja Pavlovskis remarks justly, "His apologies notwithstanding, Statius is well content with what he is doing, and his assertions of speed are too frequent not to sound like boasts." [7] Even more than boasts, his assertions may be an attempt to conceal the amount of work which he expended on a lighthearted poetic collection. One manifestation of Statius' concern for the work in his care in drawing to the reader's attention the order in which he has placed his poems. The overall structure of the collection is a major concern of the poet. It is not unlikely, then, that Statius exercised as much care in structuring the individual poems as in determining the place of the poems within the several books, and that critics of the *Silvae* have been too ready to accept his self-denigrations. One potentially significant piece of evidence on this matter has been rather consistently ignored by critics of the *Silvae*.

---

[4] Zoja Pavlovskis, "From Statius to Ennodius: a Brief History of Prose Prefaces to Poems," *RIL* 101 (1967), 542.

[5] Cf. Martial, Praef. I, *Lascivam verborum veritatem, id est epigrammaton linguam, excussarem, si meum esset exemplum: sic scribit Catullus, sic Marsus, sic Pedo, sic Gaetulicus, sic quicumque perlegitur.*

[6] See Chapter I, 5-6.

Three of the poems bear witness that a substantial period of time lapsed between the occasion for which they were written and the composition of the poems themselves. In *Silvae* V. 1 *Epicedion in Priscillam <Abascanti> Uxorem*, Statius explains that a whole year passed between the death of Priscilla and the writing of the *epicedion* lamenting her death, for Abascantus' sorrow during that time was too great to allow him to accept such a gift (*Silvae* V. 1. 16-20):

> Sera quidem tanto struitur medicina dolori,
> altera cum volucris Phoebi rota torqueat annum;
> sed cum plaga recens at adhuc in vulnere primo
> nigra domus, quis tum miseras accessus ad auris
> coniugis orbati?

Statius' own grief at the death of his father was so overwhelming, he explains, that he could not take up his pen to write him a fitting lament until three months had passed after his death (*Silvae* V. 3. 29-33):

> nam me ter relegens caelum terque ora retexens
> luna videt residem nullaque Heliconide tristis
> solantem curas: tuus ut mihi vultibus ignis
> irrubuit cineremque oculis umentibus hausi,
> vilis honos studiis.

Again, when the poet's adopted son died, he could not bring himself to compose a lament for him until a full month had passed (*Silvae* V. 5. 24-27):

---

[7] Pavlovskis, "From Statius to Ennodius," 541-542.

> hoc quoque cum nitor, ter dena luce peracta,
> acclinis tumulo planctus in carmina verto
> discordisque modos et singultantia acerba
> molior orsa lyra.

The import of these passages for the composition of the *Silvae* is clear. It is hardly likely that, in the long stretches of time that passed following these deaths and preceding the composition of Statius' *epicedia* upon them, he did not give some thought to what he would say and how he would say it when he came to commemorate these tragic losses in verse. Some of the *Silvae*, including, for example, II. 5 *Leo Mansuetus*, did indeed demand rapid composition and delivery to produce their intended effect, but, if Statius acknowledges in the three instances quoted above that composition did not follow immediately upon the event commemorated, there is nothing to prevent us from concluding that in other instances besides these *epicedia* Statius may have given careful consideration to the disposition of his *Silvae* prior to their actual composition. He may indeed have executed them in two days or less, but he may also have thought out their structure and diction well in advance.

Besides providing information on Statius' attitudes toward his occasional poetry, the prose prefaces to the several books set forth the generic names of some of the *Silvae*. While arguing that the individual *Silvae* were written in two days or less, Statius calls upon his friend Stella to vouch for this claim in the case of the wedding poem, or *epithalamium*, which he composed for him, *respondebis illi tu, Stella carissime, qui epithalamium tuum quod mihi iniunxeras, scis biduo scriptum* (Praef. I. 21-23). Statius makes the same point about *Silvae* II. 1 *Glaucias Atedi Melioris Delicatus*, which he also names generically, *at (scis) epicedio prosecutus sum adeo festinanter ut excusandam habuerim affectibus tuis celeritatem* (Praef. II. 8-10). Again, Statius explains that he has included a *consolatio* on the death of Flavius Ursus' favorite slave because of a debt which he owes to Ursus, *ad Ursum quoque nostrum, iuvenem candidissimum et sine iactura desidiae doctissimum, scriptam de amisso puero consolationem super ea quae ipsi debeo huic libro libenter inserui, quia honorem eius tibi laturus accepto est* (Praef. II. 19-23). The last poem of Book II is also assigned by the poet to a recognized poetic genre, *cludit volumen Genethliacon Lucani, quod Polla Argentaria, rarissima uxorum, cum hunc diem forte consuleremus, imputari sibi* *voluit* (Praef. II. 23-26). Finally, Statius indicates that *Silvae* IV. 4 *Epistula ad Vitorium Marcellum* is to be classified as a poetic epistle. Referring to the Via Domitiana, the subject of the previous poem, Statius writes, *cuius beneficio tu quoque maturius epistulam meam accipies quam tibi in hoc libro a Neapoli scribo* (Praef. IV. 9-10).

By assigning generic names to these poems, Statius acknowledges that he understands them to mirror the traditions of earlier examples of the *consolatio* (or *epicedion*), *genethliacon*, *epithalamium*, and poetic *epistula*.

A detailed examination of ancient rhetorical theory concerning the composition of *consolationes* (*epicedia*), *genethliaca*, *epithalamia*, and *epistulae*, and an investigation of poetic examples of these genres composed prior to the *Silvae*, will help us to determine Statius' degree of indebtedness to the theories of the handbooks and to poetic precedent. Such a systematic comparison between the rhetorical theories and Statian practice has scarcely been attempted previously, despite the widespread opinion that Statius' poetic structures in the *Silvae* are mere reflections of rhetorical canons. In his book *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*, Francis Cairns has investigated the debt of the ancient genres of non-epic non-dramatic poetry to the rhetorical handbooks, but his comments on the *Silvae* are restricted to Silvae I. 4 *Soteria Rutili Gallici*, to lines 127-145 of III. 2 *Propempticon Maecio Celeri*, and to lines 177-193 of V. 1 *Epicedion in Priscillam <Abascanti> Uxorem.*[8]

The enormous influence exercised upon the study of the *Silvae* by Friedrich Vollmer's monumental commentary on the collection is in no small degree responsible for the view that Statius' occasional poems consist of little but versified rhetorical τόποι. The presence in the *Silvae* of poems in genres about which Greek rhetoricians wrote handbook prescriptions prompts Vollmer to conclude that the poems are but school exercises:

> Wie enge Statius' Dichtung überhaupt mit der Rhetorik zusammenhängt, zeigt der Umstand, dass fast alle Arten der λόγοι ἐπιδεικτικοί, soweit sie Gelegenheitsstoffe behandeln, in den silvae vertreten sind, zum Teil mit ausdrücklicher Beibehaltung der griechischen technischen Bezeichnungen ἐπιθαλάμιον I 2, consolatio (παραμυθητικός) II 6, III 3, προπεμπτικόν (III 2. III 5) εὐχαριστικόν IV 2, γενεθλιακόν

---

[8] Francis Cairns, *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*, Edinburgh, 1972.

> II 7, ἐπικήδειον V 1.3. 5 σωτήρια I. 4. Ferner weisen auf die Rhetorenschule zurück loci communes wie silv I 3 95 ff. Plin. epp. VIII 20. 1 und der im ganzen nach den Vorschriften der Schule angelegte Aufbau der einzelnen Gedichte.[9]

Only in the case of *Silvae* I. 1 *Equs Maximus Domitiani Imp.*, however, does Vollmer adduce any concrete evidence for his statements, in the form of a comparison between the poem and the suggestions for descriptions in prose and verse by Nicolaos the Sophist. Even scholars who feel that the influence of rhetorical theory upon the *Silvae* has been exaggerated have made little real comparison between the text of the *Silvae* and the handbooks of rhetoric. In the introduction to his edition of the descriptive poems of Johannes of Gaza and Paulus Silentiarius, Paul Friedländer emphasizes that actual experiences of Statius' life played a larger part in the make-up of the *Silvae* than did any models, poetic or rhetorical:

> Überhaupt werden wir an solchen allgemeinen Anregungen für die beschreibenden Silven des Statius oft genug eher denken müssen, als an genau befolgte Muster, und bei so mannigfaltiger literarischer Abhängigkeit darf nicht übersehen werden, welchen Anteil das 'Erlebnis' an seinen Schilderungen hat.[10]

Unfortunately, Friedländer makes no specific comparison between Statius' poems and the rhetorical treatises whose influence he minimizes. In his study of the *Silvae*, Hubert Cancik is satisfied with approving and repeating Friedländer's arguments.[11] Direct comparison between Statius' *Silvae* and the handbooks is therefore in order. We may first briefly review our sources of knowledge concerning ancient rhetorical theory on the genres included in the collection.

Ancient theoreticians on rhetoric considered poetry to be a branch of rhetoric.[12] As early as the fifth century B.C., it was held that the speeches of Homer's heroes were the earliest traceable examples of rhetorical skill and that Homer was the inventor of all branches of rhetoric.[13] Poetry was felt to contain clear examples of all three branches of prose oratory. Poetic representations of accusation and defense were examples of the γένος δικανικόν, or judicial manner. Protreptic or apotreptic poetry, indeed all branches of didactic poetry, were included in the γένος συμβουλευτικόν, or deliberative manner. The genres represented in the *Silvae*, including the *epithalamium*, *epicedion*, *genethliacon*, *eucharisticon*, and *propempticon*, were types of the γένος ἐπιδεικτικόν, or display manner. Thus the suggestions which rhetoricians offered for the composition of the various classes of epideictic speeches (λόγοι ἐπιδεικτικοί) could readily be incorporated by poets. Descriptions of the technique of one or more types of λόγοι ἐπιδεικτικοί survive in the treatise *On Style* by Demetrius; in an anonymous treatise, dating probably from the second century A.D., which is incorrectly attributed to Dionysius of Halicarnassus;[14] and in the treatises Γενεθλίων διαίρεσις τῶν ἐπιδεικτικῶν and Περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν composed in the third century A.D. by Menander of Laodicea. Obviously, all of our knowledge concerning ancient theories of epideictic genres is derived from treatises written after the death of Statius. The prescriptions laid down in them are based, however, on the observations which their authors made of the actual practice of rhetoricians and poets as early as Homer, and it is therefore valid to consider the influence of such treatises upon Statius.

---

[9] Friedrich Vollmer, ed. *P. Papinii Statii Silvarum Libri*, herausgegeben und erklärt, Leipzig, 1898, 27 note 2.

[10] Paul Friedländer, ed. *Johannes von Gaza und Paulus Silentiarius Kunstbeschreibungen justinianischer Zeit* (Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Kommentare zu griechischen und römischen Schriftstellern), Leipzig, 1912, 69.

[11] Hubert Cancik, *Untersuchungen zur lyrischen Kunst des P. Papinius Statius* (Spudasmata, 13), Hildesheim, 1965, 34-37.

[12] Theodore C. Burgess, "Epideictic Literature," *University of Chicago Studies in Classical Philology* 3 (1902), 93; George Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*, Princeton, 1963, 153.

The ancient rhetoricians assert that the suggestions which they offer may be used both by writers in prose and by poets. In his treatises, Menander follows the regular ancient practice of identifying poetry and rhetoric, for he draws his illustrative examples indifferently from poetry and prose. In his discussion of the technique of the ὕμνος, for instance, he explains that the ποιητής, the συγγραφεύς, and the ῥήτωρ may all follow his precepts, for they all employ the same compositional principles.[15] In the remainder of this chapter, we will examine the prescriptions of the handbooks listed above for the types of compositions included in the *Silvae*, and discuss Statius' relation to other ancient poems composed in these genres.

---

[13] Cairns, 34-36. See also George Kennedy, "The Ancient Dispute over Rhetoric in Homer," *AJPh* 78 (1957), 23-25.

[14] For a discussion of the authorship of this treatise, see George Kennedy, *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World 300 B.C.—A.D. 300*, Princeton, 1972, 634-637.

[15] Leonard Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci*, Leipzig, 1856; reprinted Frankfurt, 1966, 3, 344.

A. *Consolationes*

We may well wonder why Statius has chosen to entitle *Silvae* II. 1 an *epicedion* and II. 6 a *consolatio*, since both poems are formal laments on the death of favorite slave boys. Moreover, the manuscripts call *Silvae* III. 3 a *consolatio* and V. 1 and 3 *epicedia*. Although some ancient rhetoricians define the *epicedion* as a song delivered in the presence of the corpse,[16] thus distinguishing it from the *consolatio* whose function is the comforting of the survivors after the funeral, other theoreticians, including the Pseudo-Dionysius, note that the various terms for dirges and consolatory poems tended to be used synonymously. Pseudo-Dionysius explains that ἐπιτάφιοι, ἐπικήδειοι, and θρῆνοι were often considered synonymous.[17] Statius himself makes no distinction in his treatment of the *consolatio* and *epicedion*. Book II. 1 *Glaucias Atedi Melioris Delicatus*, which Statius calls an *epicedion* in the preface to Book II (Praef. II. 8), contains a distinct section setting forth many of the types of solace regularly expressed in the *consolatio* (183-234), as do V. 1 *Epicedion in Priscillam <Abascanti> Uxorem* (222-262) and V. 3 *Epicedion in Patrem Suum* (277-293), placing these poems, despite their name, within the genre of the *consolatio*. Book V. 5 *Epicedion in Puerum Suum* breaks off before any solace is voiced, but otherwise the treatment and disposition of themes is identical with that of Statius' other *consolationes*.

Also falling into the genre of the *consolatio* are *Silvae* II. 4 *Psittacus Eiusdem* and II. 5 *Leo Mansuetus*. These poems are miniature *epicedia* commemorating the death of the pet parrot of Atedius Melior and of a tamed lion, a type of poem much favored by Greek poets since Hellenistic times and by Roman poets of all periods.[18] Statius' handling of the commonplaces of consolation literature in these miniatures differs little from his method in the six *epicedia* on the death of humans.

---

[16] For example, Proclus in Photius *Bibliotheca* 321^{a}30.

[17] Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Opuscula*, ed. by Hermann Usener and Ludwig Radermacher, Leipzig, 1904-1929, 2, 278. On this fluidity of terminology among ancient theoreticians, Cairns, 18, writes, "Ancient rhetoricians, with their usual disregard of logic and concern for convenience, could impose names on pre-existent and well-known generic patterns with a view to emphasizing either the distinctions between the secondary elements of different genres or the similarity between the primary elements of different genres."

Extant poetic and rhetorical examples, testimonies, and descriptions in rhetorical handbooks inform us thoroughly about the ancient theory and practice of consolation literature.[19] Many of the approaches to offering solace to the bereaved which would be codified in the handbooks of rhetoric written centuries later as commonplaces of consolation literature can be seen fully developed already in the epics of Homer. The consolation that all must die is found in Telemachus' advice to his mother to cease weeping long enough to hear the song of the minstrel Phemius, for Odysseus was not the only man who perished at Troy (*Odyssey* I. 345-355). At *Iliad* XXIV. 549-551, Achilles consoles Priam by telling him to bear up because his tears will not resurrect Hector. Because of the philosophical implications of the phenomenon of death, particularly the questions of immortality and the afterlife, the composition of formal consolations was at first the work of philosophers, and in this stage, before consolation became the province of poets, consolatory literature took the form of treatises in prose, letters, and speeches. For example, Crantor the Academic (ca. 335-275 B.C.) wrote a treatise entitled Περὶ πένθους, which was much admired by Cicero for its tenderness and good advice (*Academica* II. 135).

---

[18] Gerhard Herrlinger, *Totenklage um Tiere in der antiken Dichtung,* mit einem Anhang byzantinischer, mittellateinischer und neuhochdeutscher Tierepikedien (Tübinger Beitrage zur Altertumswissenschaft, 8), Stuttgart, 1930, 1-2.

[19] The literature on ancient consolation is rich. Among important studies of various aspects of the topic may be mentioned Carolus Buresch, *Consolationum a Graecis Romanisque Scriptarum Historia Critica* (Leipziger Studien zur Classischen Philologie, 9, 1), Leipzig, 1886; Sister Mary Evaristus Moran, *The Consolation of Death in Ancient Greek Literature* (Dissertation, Catholic University of America, 1917); Sister Mary Edmond Fern, *The Latin Consolatio as a Literary Type* (Dissertation, St. Louis University, 1931), St. Meinrad, Indiana, 1941. Discussions of consolatory elements in ancient epitaphs include Bruno Lier, "Topica Carminum Sepulcralium Latinorum," *Philologus* 62 (1903), 445-477 and 563-603; 63 (1904), 54-65; Richmond Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs,* Urbana, 1962. Considerations of Statius' *consolationes* include Kenneth Latta Baucom, "Four *Consolationes* of Statius" (Thesis, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1963); Emmanuele Griset, "Il Problema della 'Silva' V, 3 di Stazio," *RSC* 10 (1962), 128-132; Clifford Herschel Moore, "The Epicedia of Statius," in *Kittredge Anniversary Papers,* New York, 1967, 127-137.

The Romans wrote extensively on the theory of the consolation. In 45 B.C., Cicero wrote a *Consolatio* designed to assuage his grief on the death of his daughter, while in the opening book of the *Tusculan Disputations*, he argued that death should be despised because it is no ill. In *Ad Familiares* V. 16, Cicero consoles Titius on the death of his children by assuring him that time will ease his sorrow. The philosophical works of Seneca contain two formal consolations on death, the *Consolatio ad Marciam*, and the *Consolatio ad Polybium*. *Epistulae Morales* LXIII is a consolation written to Lucilius on the death of his friend Flaccus, in which the philosopher urges Lucilius to remember that life is on loan to mortals and that the passage of time will lighten his grief.

When Roman poets took over the composition of consolations from the philosophers, the emphasis shifted from consolation to lament and praise of the dead. In the *Consolatio ad Liviam*, for example, addressed to Livia on the death of her son Drusus on campaign in Germany in 9 B.C., verses 1-328 contain the praise and lament, while the formal commonplaces of consolation are confined to verses 329-474. The poem begins with an Introduction (1-36) in which the poet commiserates with Livia and questions his ability to console her adequately. This is followed by a *laudatio* in which Drusus' martial deeds are praised (37-120). The circumstances of his death and the comfort accorded to him in his last hours by the presence of the grief-stricken Tiberius are next treated (121-164). Drusus' funeral and the universal sorrow occasioned by his death are handled in considerable detail (165-298). A *laudatio* of Antonia, wife of Drusus, contributes to the pathos of the situation (299-328). A number of the *solacia* regularly employed in consolatory literature follow (329-444): Drusus is happy in Elysium; he had achieved much in his brief life; we are all hastening to the same end; others have mourned in vain for loved ones, including Andromache, Hecuba, Thetis, and Octavia. Finally, Drusus appears in a prosopopoeia and comforts his mother (445-474).

By the time the rhetoricians came to formulate rules for the composition of λόγοι ἐπιτάφιοι and ἐκικήδειοι they thus had abundant examples, both poetic and philosophical, upon which to base their recommendations. They recognized that in prior examples praise mingled with lament and consolation had become the key ingredients of the *consolatio*. In the μέθοδος ἐπιταφίων contained in the Τέχνη ῥητορική of the Pseudo-Dionysius, the author explains that, taken in general, the ἐπιτάφιος was a form of *laudatio*, Συνελόντι μὲν οὖν ὁ ἐπιτάφιος ἔπαινός ἐστι τῶν κατοιχομένων,[20] and as such contains ἐγκώμια πατρίδος, γένους, φύσεως, ἀγωγῆς, πράξεως. The second main division of the ἐπικήδειος is, according to the author, the παραμυθητικὸς λόγος, the consolation proper. Here one reminds the parents of a dead child that, if they are still of child bearing age, they can have more children. One can say that the person's death was a blessing or, if his sufferings were prolonged, that he bore up bravely. If he died young, one should say that the gods loved him, if in middle age, that he displayed every virtue. If he died in old age, one says that he enjoyed all that life can give. As for the end of the παραμυθητικὸς λόγος, the consoler should hold out the hope of immortality of the soul, ἐπὶ τέλει δὲ περὶ ψυχῆς ἀναγκαῖον εἰπεῖν, ὅτι ἀθάνατος . . . .[21] Menander's treatment of the division of the *consolatio* closely parallels the discussion of Pseudo-Dionysius. He defines the consolation as a lament which magnifies the deceased and the fact of his death, ὁ παραμυθητικὸς δὲ λόγος ὀδύρεται μὲν καὶ αὐτὸς τὸν πεπτωκότα καὶ ἐπὶ μέγεθος ἐγείρει τὴν συμφορὰν αὔξων.[22] The consoler should keep in mind that encomium should be prominent, χρὴ δὲ εἰδέναι ὅτι συνίσταται ἡ μονωδία ἐκ τῶν ἐγκωμιαστικῶν γένους, φύσεως, ἀνατροφῆς, παιδείας, ἐπιτηδευμάτων, πράξεων.[23] The second division will be the consolation. Here one points out that death is the common lot of man, for even heroes and the children of gods must die. Even cities die. One should say that, if life has any profit for human beings, the deceased has reaped it all and has escaped life's brutalities.

The consolatory poems of Statius are complex and fully developed examples of the genre, not only incorporating all the *solacia* offered in prior consolation literature, but also exhibiting in full all the divisions of the *consolatio* which had been included by earlier poets and prose writers and recommended by rhetoricians. The Statian *consolatio* regularly consists of an introduction, an encomium upon the deceased, an account of his last illness and death, a detailed exposition of his funeral rites, and a number of *solacia* offered to the survivors. Statius' consolations are fully in the tradition of the consolatory letters of Cicero and Pliny, the treatises of Seneca, and the *Consolatio ad Liviam.* It is therefore not in the format that we should seek the individuality and originality of the *consolationes* contained in the *Silvae,* but rather in the tone of the poems and in the position which Statius adopts toward the deceased and his survivors.

---

[20] Dionysius, *Opuscula*, 2, 278.

[21] *Ibid.*, 283.

[22] Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci*, 3, 413.

[23] *Ibid.*

It is not difficult to find traces of the influence of the handbooks on the *consolationes* of Statius. The *laudatio* with which the poet honors his dead father in *Silvae* V. 3 *Epicedion in Patrem Suum* follows closely the handbook descriptions of the ἔπαινος of the λόγος ἐπιτάφιος, reflecting if not exactly reproducing the order of the encomiastic elements as they are given in the Pseudo-Dionysius:

γένος	— you spring from a family not undistinguished though poor (116-118)
πατρίς	— both Grecian Hyele and Parthenope claim you as their scion (124-129)
ἀγωγή	— even as a young man you entered the poetic contests of Naples (133-145)
ἐπιτηδεύματα	— your learning and teaching ability prompted parents to entrust their children to your tutelage (146-183)
πρᾶξις	— your poem on the burning of the Capitol proved a solace for the destroyed temples (195-208)
φύσις	— your nature was earnest and pious, untroubled by love of gain or immodesty (246-252a).

The great length of the *laudatio* in *Silvae* V. 3 (80-252a, or 60% of the 293-line poem) illustrates the disproportionate scope regularly assumed by this section of the Statian *consolatio* in comparison with the *lamentatio* and *solacia.* The consolatory poems of Statius, like the other genres represented in the *Silvae,* are celebrations of the events, happy and sad, in the lives of Statius' friends. Equally so, they are a record of Statius' reaction to and involvement in these events. The poet was aware that his poems might live on, as he states in *Silvae* II. 3 *Arbor Atedi Melioris* (62-63):

> Haec tibi parva quidem genitali luce paramus
> dona, sed ingenti forsan victura sub aevo.

He similarly regarded his *consolationes* as an attempt to secure immortality through verse for those whose death he memorialized. These poems are in effect an everlasting sepulchre, as he makes clear in *Silvae* V. 1 *Epicedion in Priscillam <Abascanti> Uxorem* 11-15:

> nos tibi, laudati iuvenis rarissima coniunx,
> longa nec obscurum finem latura perenni
> temptamus dare iusta lyra, modo dexter Apollo
> quique venit iuncto mihi semper Apolline Caesar
> annuat: haud alio melius condere sepulcro.

Praise, as Statius employs it, is not only the poet's means of securing a generous welcome for his verses from his wealthy friends, but is his way of immortalizing his friendship with them and of giving lasting significance to the small pleasures and trials of life.

It is the intense personal involvement in the sadness of his friends which most differentiates the *consolationes* of Statius from those discussed above. Traditionally the consoler maintained a position of aloofness, thus providing a focus of calm and rationality which the bereaved could use for support. Nothing could be further from Statius' method. He suffers the loss as much as does his friend.

He tells Melior that he can hardly begin to console him because of the tears that well up in his eyes (*Silvae* II. 1 *Glaucias Atedi Melioris Delicatus* 14-18):

> Nemo vetat: satiare malis aegrumque dolorem
> libertate doma. iam flendi expleta voluptas?
> iamque preces fessus non indignaris amicas?
> iamne canam? lacrimas en et mea carmina in ipso
> ore natant tristesque cadunt in verba liturae.

Even a slave, Statius realized, could earn his master's bitter tears (*Silvae* II. 6 *Consolatio ad Flavium Ursum de Amissione Pueri Delicati* 8-14):

> famulum (quia rerum nomina caeca
> sic miscet Fortuna manu nec pectora novit),
> sed famulum gemis, Vrse, pium, sed amore fideque
> has meritum lacrimas, cui maior stemmate iuncto
> libertas ex mente fuit. ne comprime fletus,
> ne pudeat; rumpat frenos dolor iste diesque,
> si tam dura placent, hominem gemis.

It is in this profound sympathy that the *consolationes* of Statius are most original, and most Statian.

B. *Genethliaca*

In the preface to *Silvae* II, Statius calls *Silvae* II. 7 a *genethliacon* (Praef. II. 24). The *genethliacon* is a composition which celebrates a birthday and is heavily laden with encomium of the subject whose birthday is honored. Although *Silvae* II. 7 is the only piece in the collection which is called a *genethliacon* by either Statius or the manuscripts, it is not the only example of the genre in the *Silvae*. *Silvae* IV. 7 *Ode Lyrica ad Vibium Maximum* voices Statius' desire to see his friend Maximus, but the second half of the poem (29-58) is the expression of congratulations to Maximus on the birth of his first child. In *Silvae* IV. 8 *Gratulatio ad Iulium Menecraten*, Statius once again offers congratulations on the birth of a new offspring, Menecrates' third child.

Descriptions of the technique of the *genethliacon* survive by Pseudo-Dionysius and Menander, whose treatment closely follows that of Pseudo-Dionysius. The account of Pseudo-Dionysius offers suggestions for compositions which honor the birthday of adults, while Menander's treatment of the genre also includes recommendations for the *genethliacon* which honors the birthday of a new-born child.

Pseudo-Dionysius suggests that the writer begin with some praise of the birthdate itself, if it has any particular distinction with regard to its place in the month (for example, if it is the first day of the month, or the eighth, which is sacred to the gods). Then one should praise the season in which the birthdate falls. Passing to the place of the subject's birth, one should point out the special virtues of the birthplace. The main section of the *genethliacon*, the ἔπαινος upon the subject himself, is next, and should contain praise of his strength, beauty, courage, prudence, justice, and temperance. Here mythic and historical parallels may be adduced. One should not forget to mention any extraordinary knowledge which the subject may possess, such as an understanding of medicine, rhetoric, or philosophy. The speaker should show what sort of person his subject is and is likely to become. Finally, the speaker must ask the gods that the subject may be allowed a long life of prosperity even greater than that which he has experienced in past years.[24]

Menander recommends that, if the subject of the *genethliacon* is a new-born child, one should begin with a proem which may assert that the child was born with the ability to speak. Then one praises the date of the birth, after which one should turn to the encomium upon the family and character of the child. Since a new-born child has not accomplished great deeds, one can prophesy that he will reach the acme of excellence, will bring honor to his city, and will grace the assembly of his fellow citizens.[25]

Silvae II. 7 *Genethliacon Lucani* stands outside the mould of the birthday poem in that it celebrates the birth of a fellow-poet who had been dead for almost three decades. Yet several of the ingredients recommended for inclusion in the *genethliacon* by Pseudo-Dionysius are clearly in evidence. Corduba, the place of the poet's birth, is praised and said to equal Athens in the production of olive oil (*Silvae* II. 7. 28-29):

---

[24] Dionysius, *Opuscula*, 2, 269.

[25] Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci*, 3, 413.

> quae Tritonidi fertilis Athenas
> unctis, Baetica, provocas trapetis.

Nor is ἔπαινος of the subject lacking. This takes the form of a prophecy by the Muse Calliope, who praises the poet's vast talents in poetry (42):

> longaevos cito transiture vatis,

and enumerates his works, to which those of Ennius, Lucretius, Varro of Atax, and even Vergil must give place (79-80):

> quid maius loquar? ipsa te Latinis
> Aeneis venerabitur canentem.

Statius could not, however, avoid mention of Lucan's tragic end, and at 89, instead of wishing for a long life for the poet, he makes the Muse utter a cry of desperation (89-90):

> O saevae nimium gravesque Parcae!
> o numquam data longa fata summis!

This pronouncement is in direct contrast to the cheerful aspect of the traditional *genethliacon* as the rhetoricians portray it. Instead of prophecies of a long and brilliant life for Lucan, an extended *lamentatio*, in the manner of Statius' *epicedia*, forms the end of the Muse's speech (89-104). All she can promise Lucan is the bitter silence of death (104):

> o dirum scelus! o scelus! tacebis.

The poem ends with consolatory remarks offered to Lucan's widow Polla Argentaria (105-135), in particular the assurance that her husband despises his earthly fate and keeps the company of Pompey and Cato (111-115). Statius specifically calls his reflections here *solacia* (128). Statius has, in a strikingly original manner, combined the material of two contrasting poetic genres, the *genethliacon* and the *epicedion*. *Lamentatio* and *consolatio*, characteristic of the *epicedion*, show *Silvae* II. 7 to be a type of composition far different from what the handbooks prescribe for the *genethliacon*.

C. *Epithalamium*

Silvae I. 2 *Epithalamium in Stellam et Violentillam* is the sole instance of a wedding song among Statius' occasional poems. As in the case of the *epicedia* and *genethliaca*, Statius had at his disposal a rich tradition of poetic examples and theoretical treatments in rhetorical handbooks upon which to rely for structural and thematic guidelines in the composition of his wedding song. Poetic depictions of wedding festivities date back to Homer. The shield of Achilles in Homer's account contained a representation of a wedding procession in which the bride was led from her chamber to the accompaniment of a loud hymenaeal song (*Iliad* XVIII. 491-496), and the Hesiodic *Shield of Heracles* includes a brief description of a wedding procession (273-280) much akin to Homer's. Sappho wrote a book of *epithalamia* in a variety of lyric meters and in dactylic hexameters. In his *epinicia*, Pindar included brief descriptions of the weddings of Apollo and Coronis (*Pythian Odes* III. 14-19), and of Peleus and Thetis and Cadmus and Harmonia (*Pythian Odes* III. 88-95). In the *Troades*, the mad Cassandra sings a marriage song in honor of the wedding which she will never celebrate (307-340). The *epithalamium* seems to have been a popular poetic form among the Alexandrians as well. Callimachus wrote an ode in elegiacs on the marriage of Ptolemy II to Arsinoe, while Theocritus' eighteenth *Idyll* sings of the wedding of Helen to Menelaus.

The pre-Statian Latin *epithalamium* is represented by the lost wedding songs of Calvus,[26] the lost *Hymenaeus* of Ticidas,[27] poems LXI, LXII, and LXIV of Catullus, and the lost *Hymenaeus* of Ovid.[28] In poem LXI, written in Glyconics, Catullus celebrates the marriage of his friend Manlius Torquatus to Vinia Aurunculeia. The poem thus honors a real marriage, in contrast to LXII, a hexametric poetic contest between choruses of boys and girls which gives expression to typical wishes but seems intended for no specific marriage. Catullus LXIV is a long hexametric poem on the marriage of Peleus and Thetis.

The handbooks of rhetoric provide us with detailed information on the theory of how to compose wedding poems. In the μέθοδος ἐπιθαλαμίου of the Τέχνη ῥητορική of the Pseudo-Dionysius,[29] the reader is instructed to emphasize the fact that marriage is necessary for mortals for the preservation of their race. Next one should speak of the beauty and learning of the bridal couple, and of the many advantages which the couple enjoys from fortune and training. One can mention how others feel about the marriage under discussion, including relatives, strangers, and the state, and claim that the marriage is the talk of the town. After the ἐγκώμιον comes an exhortation to the pair to live in harmony, προτροπή τις ἔστω τοῖς γαμοῦσιν πρὸς τὸ σπουδάζειν περὶ ἀλλήλους καὶ ὁμονοεῖν ὅ τι μάλιστα.[30] At the end of the ἐπιθαλάμιον there should be a prayer that children be born of the union as quickly as possible.

---

[26] Calvus, frag. 4-8 Morel.

[27] Ticidas, frag. 1 Morel.

[28] Ovid refers to this poem in *Epistulae ex Ponto* I. 2. 131-132:

ille ego, qui duxi vestros Hymenaeon ad ignes
 et cecini fausto carmina digna toro.

[29] Dionysius, *Opuscula*, 2, 270-271.

A much more extensive account of the theory of the ἐπιθαλάμιον is that of Menander, who gives detailed suggestions for the effective structuring of such a composition in the section περὶ ἐπιθαλαμίου of his Περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν. He defines the ἐπιθαλάμιον as a composition which celebrates the marriage chamber, the newlyweds, offspring, and, above all, the god of marriage, and is full of charming love stories, ὁ επιθαλάμιος λέγεται ὑπό τινων καὶ γαμήλιος, λόγος δ' ἐστὶν ὕμνων θαλάμους τε καὶ παστάδας καὶ νυμφίους καὶ γένος, καὶ πρό γε πάντων αὐτὸν τὸν θεὸν τῶν γάμων· χαίρει δὲ διήγμασιν ἐπαφροδίτοις τε καὶ ἐρωτικοῖς.[31] As a προοίμιον, one may mention some marriages which the gods attended, like that of Peleus, and say that just as Apollo played his lyre and each god offered some gift at that wedding, so will the composer of the *epithalamium* sing of this wedding. After the proem, Menander recommends a section on the god of marriage demonstrating the proposition that marriage is a necessary institution. The composer will note that it is Ἔρως who joins heaven to earth and that by Ἔρως the sea, air, and stars were created. Next will come the encomium on the bridal couple, μετὰ τὸν περὶ τοῦ γάμου λόγου, ἐν ᾧ τὸν θεὸν ὕμνησας, ἥξεις ἐπὶ τὰ τῶν γαμούντων ἐγκώμια.[32] Here one should speak of the couple as equals, neither exalting the one nor depreciating the other. After a section dealing with the families of the pair, one should turn to the accomplishments of the couple, such as a high degree of learning or some musical talent. Virtues like modesty, mildness, and physical beauty in the bride are to be singled out for praise. Then one may describe how the entire city came to the wedding and how the bridal chamber was fitted out with flowers. Let

---

[30] *Ibid.*, 271.
[31] Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci*, 3, 399.
[32] *Ibid.*, p. 402.

Artemis prophesy the birth of children equal to their parents in virtue, and end the λόγος with prayers for the speedy birth of children.[33]

A number of the prescriptions laid down by the handbooks are reflected in the wedding poems of Catullus. In LXI, Hymen plays the prominent role recommended by Menander, being invoked in refrains in each poem. Catullus argues that without Venus a land cannot provide protectors for its borders (LXI, 71-74), an aspect of the τόπος that marriage is necessary to the future of mankind. The virtues and accomplishments of both bride and groom are praised extensively. Vinia Aurunculeia is likened to Venus (LXI, 16-19) and is termed a beauty whom no woman could surpass (LXI, 82-86). She is modest (LXI, 79), loving (LXI, 169-171), and pure (LXI, 217-223). The groom is handsome (LXI, 190-192), loving (LXI, 195-198), and of ancient lineage (LXI, 206-208). Just as Menander recommends that the bride be likened to a rose, so Catullus compares Vinia to a hyacinth (LXI, 87-89) and later to a poppy (LXI, 188). As both Pseudo-Dionysius and Menander recommend, the poem ends with a wish that children be born of the union as quickly as possible (LXI, 204-228).[34] Other elements of Catullus' poem are, however, purely Roman, and owe nothing to the prescriptions of Greek handbooks. The forcible removal of the bride from her mother (LXI, 56-60), the shouting of Fescennine verses and of the name of Talassius (LXI, 122-130), and the custom of carrying the bride over the threshold (LXI, 162-164) demonstrate Catullus' procedure of working Roman wedding customs into the context of a Greek poetic genre and creating from their union a new and original poetic whole.

A number of elements recommended by rhetoricians and standard in prior wedding poems are in evidence as well in *Silvae* I. 2 *Epithalamium in Stellam et Violentillam*, but Statius' handling of the commonplaces of the genre and his manner of introducing his own personality into the context of his poem make his only *epithalamium*, like Catullus LXI, a highly individualized and personal composition. Statius introduces the gods in a prominent role in his *epithalamium* and explains how they brought about the marriage of Stella and

---

[33] *Ibid.*, 404.

[34] On Catullus' technique in his wedding poems, see in general Arthur Leslie Wheeler, "Tradition in the Epithalamium," *AJPh* 51 (1930), 205-223.

Violentilla. In an αἴτιον (51-193), Statius explains how Amor begged his mother Venus to allow the lovesick Stella to win over the recalcitrant Violentilla. Statius' motivation for his portrayal of gods and mortals in intimate contact in his *epithalamium* is his desire to elevate the occurrences in the lives of his friends to a level of permanent significance. By making the gods the cause of the union of Stella and Violentilla, Statius implies that heaven takes an active interest in the lives of his friends.

Statius retains the exhortation to the bridal couple to unite in marriage, but places it in the mouth of Venus (*Silvae* I. 2. 182-187), in a passage highly reminiscent of Lucretius I. 2-9:

> ergo age, iunge toros atque otia deme iuventae.
> quas ego non gentes, quae non face corda iugali?
> alituum pecudumque mihi durique ferarum
> non renuere greges; ipsum in conubia terrae
> aethera, cum pluviis rarescunt nubila, solvo.
> sic rerum series mundique revertitur aetas.

In keeping with the traditions of the *epithalamium*, Statius ends his poem with a prayer for the speedy birth of children (266-277), and even here he includes praise of the bridal couple.

Encomium is indeed the main ingredient of Statius' *epithalamium*, but in contrast to the recommendations of Pseudo-Dionysius and Menander, Statius does not restrict the ἐγκώμιον τῶν γαμούντων to a distinct section of the poem but allows it to pervade the composition. Of greatest interest is Statius' emphasis on Stella's talents as an elegiac poet (7-10, 94-102, 172-173, 195-199, 247-255). Stella's and Statius' common interest in poetry allows Statius not only to praise his friend's achievements, but also to show how close they are as fellow servants of the Muses. Statius explains that the reasons for his love of Stella are manifold (*Silvae* I. 2. 256-259):

> Me certe non unus amor simplexque canendi
> causa trahit: tecum similes iunctaeque Camenae,
> Stella, mihi, multumque pares bacchamur ad aras
> et sociam doctis haurimus ab amnibus undam.

By such assertions, Statius establishes the same sympathy and intimate involvement with his subject that we noted in the case of the *epicedia*.

Stella's activity as an elegiac poet prompts Statius to fuse genres in the *epithalamium* as he had done in the *Genethliacon Lucani*, moving from the conventions of the wedding song into the world of the elegy in his portrayal of the love of Stella and Violentilla. The groom is a hapless victim of the *servitium amoris* suffered by the Roman elegists, as Amor explains (*Silvae* I. 2 76-78):

> quamvis Ausoniis multum gener ille petitus
> matribus, edomui victum dominaeque potentis
> ferre iugum et longos iussi sperare per annos.

Only slowly will Violentilla accept the advances of Stella, remembering at last the laments of her *exclusus amator* (*Silvae* I. 2. 194-196):

> His mulcet dictis tacitaeque inspirat honorem
> conubii. redeunt animo iam dona precesque
> et lacrimae vigilesque viri prope limina questus.

As in his *genethliaca* and *epicedia* Statius achieves originality in the timeworn genre of the *epithalamium* by a fusion of elements proper to a number of genres, a degree of personal involvement in the action of the poem unusual in the wedding song, and a far more generous employment of encomium than the handbooks of rhetoric prescribe.

D. *Epistula*

Statius' only essay in the poetic epistle is *Silvae* IV. 4 *Epistula ad Vitorium Marcellum.* The art of letter writing was treated by Demetrius in his work *On Style* of which sections 223-235 deal with ὁ ἐπιστολικὸς χαρακτήρ. According to Demetrius, the style of the ἐπιστολή should be a little more studied than dialogue since the letter is a reproduction of speech committed to writing and sent as a sort of gift, δεῖ γὰρ ὑποκατεσκευάσθαι πῶς μᾶλλον τὴν ἐπιστολήν· ὁ μὲν γὰρ μιμεῖται αὐτοσχεδιάζοντα, ἡ δὲ γράφεται καὶ δῶρον πέμπεται τρόπον τινά (224). Important to letter writing are the frequent revelations of character in it, for each man reveals his soul in his letters, πλεῖστον δὲ ἐχέτω τὸ ἠθικὸν ἡ ἐπιστολή, ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ διάλογος· σχεδὸν γὰρ εἰκόνα ἕκαστος τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ψυχῆς γράφει τὴν ἐπιστολήν (227). Indeed, the letter is a brief expression of the author's kind heart, and treats intimate subject matter in a simple manner (231). The beauty of the letter lies in its expressions of friendship and in its frequent proverbs, κάλλος μέντοι αὐτῆς αἵ τε φιλικαὶ φιλοφρονήσεις καὶ πυκναὶ παροιμίαι ἐνοῦσαι (232). Stylistically, the letter should mix the graceful style, marked by smooth construction and elegant words, and the plain, which employs the vocabulary in current use and avoids metaphor and ornament, καθόλου δὲ μιμίχθω ἡ επιστολὴ κατὰ τὴν ἑρμηνείαν ἐκ δυοῖν χαρακτήροιν τούτοιν, τοῦ τε χαρίεντος καὶ τοῦ ἰσχνοῦ (235). The structure of the letter, reflecting its close relationship to the dialogue, should be somewhat loose, καὶ τῇ συντάξει μέντοι λελύσθω μᾶλλον (229).

Statius fills his poetic letter with expressions of friendship (φιλικαὶ φιλοφρονήσεις). Gallus, the mutual friend of Statius and Marcellus, is termed *noster amor* by the poet (21). Statius says he knows that, if Gallus is with Marcellus, he is with both his friends at least in spirit (24-25):

> quod si tibi promixus haeret,
> non ego nunc vestro procul a sermone recedo.

Statius is worried that Marcellus is overworking himself (28-29):

> exue curis
> pectus et assiduo temet furare labori,

and follows this friendly advice with a sort of παροιμία (33-34):

> vires instigat alitque
> tempestiva quies: maior post otia virtus.

Everywhere, in his concern for his busy friend's health (28-42), in his good wishes for a successful future for Marcellus' son (74-77), and in his need for Marcellus' advice before attempting an epic on Domitian's exploits (96-100), Statius reveals his gentle, sympathetic character and his constant need to feel loved by his friends, precisely the qualities of his character which Statius reveals in the *epicedia* and *epithalamium*, and we can attribute their appearance in the *epistula* both to the poet's own personality making itself felt and to an application of handbook guidelines.

The direct model for the structure of Statius' letter is not rhetorical theory but a poem of Ovid. *Tristia* III. 7 is an *epistula* to Perilla in which Ovid exhorts her not to allow his downfall to keep her from exercising her talents in poetry. Ovid's poem begins with a prelude in ten verses addressed, like the prelude of Statius' poem, to the letter. The first word of each poem is an imperative directed to the letter, *vade* (Ovid), *curre* (Statius), and in each poem directions follow on how the letter can reach the addressee (Ovid, 3-4; Statius, 1-7). Although each poem contains extended praise for the addressee, the purpose of Ovid's poem is not primarily encomiastic. The tone of Ovid's letter is earnest, for he is trying to convince Perilla not to allow her talent to wither because of his misfortune. When Ovid contrasts his dreary life with the promise which Perilla's life holds (*Tristia* III. 7. 13-14, 20-22), he is not flattering the girl but urging her to write; when Statius contrasts the lowly life of the poet with the exalted position of Marcellus in the service of the state (*Silvae* IV. 4. 43-49, 56-70, 101-105), he is flattering his friend and attempting, as elsewhere in the *Silvae*, to make the most of his friend's accomplishments. Yet even if Statius' *epistula* did not show obvious parallels with Ovid's poem in structure and thought, his striking word borrowing *ingeniine bonis* (22), taken from *Tristia* III. 7. 44 *ingeniique bonis*, would prove Statius' debt to Ovid in *Silvae* IV. 4.

E. *Ecloga*

Statius probably intends rather to characterize the manner of *Silvae* III. *Ecloga ad Claudiam Uxorem* than to assign it to a distinct genre when he terms it an *ecloga*. The meaning of *ecloga* is a selection (ἐκλογή) from a larger work, as in Varro's reference to selections made from a chronicle, *eclogas ex annalei descriptas*.[35] Cicero also uses the term to denote select passages from a larger composition. He instructs Atticus to have selections made from his treatise *De Gloria* for the use of Atticus' slave Salvius, *De Gloria misi tibi. Custodies igitur, ut soles, sed notentur* ἐκλογαὶ *quas Salvius bonos auditores nactus in convivio dumtaxat legat* (*Ad Att.* XVI. 2. 6). The term seems to have been used in general to refer to short poems, as in the case of Vergil's bucolic collection. Again, the younger Pliny includes the term among titles which he suggests for his brief hendecasyllabic poems, *Proinde, sive epigrammata sive idyllia sive eclogas sive, ut multi, poematia seu quod aliud vocare malueris, licebit voces; ego tantum hendecasyllabos praesto* (*Epistulae* IV. 14. 9).

In the preface to *Silvae* III, Statius explains that his *ecloga* is an exhortation to his wife to return with him to Naples, a conversation in relaxed style (*securus sermo*, Praef. III. 23), as befits an address to one's wife, and intended rather to persuade than to please, *summa est ecloga qua mecum secedere Neapolim Claudiam meam exhortor. hic, si verum dicimus, sermo est, et quidem securus ut cum uxore et qui persuadere malit quam placere* (Praef. III. 21-24). Statius' poem to his wife is not an *ecloga* in the Varronian sense of a selection from a larger work, but its manner exactly parallels Pliny's designation of his own brief poems as *eclogae*. Although it would be difficult to determine Statius' literary models for *Silvae* III. 5 from the rather nondescript nature of the term *ecloga*, a clue to its literary antecedents may be contained in Statius' characterization of the poem as a relaxed conversation. In his catalogue of Lucan's works in *Silvae* II. 7, Statius mentions a certain *adlocutio Pollae,* a charming address of Lucan to his wife:

---

[35] Varro in Charisius, 120 Keil.

> hinc castae titulum decusque Pollae
> iucunda dabis adlocutione (*Silvae* II. 7. 62-63).

Perhaps Statius' conversation with his wife was modeled upon Lucan's address to his wife. The degree of debt to this work must remain unknown, since the *adlocutio* is lost entirely.

F. *Propemptica*

The manuscripts of the *Silvae* assign other of the poems, which Statius does not name generically in the prose prefaces, to well-established genres. They class *Silvae* III. 2 as a *propempticon. Silvae* III. 4 *Capilli Flavi Earini,* a poem wishing the sheared locks of Domitian's favorite a safe journey to Pergamum, also includes all the themes of the *propempticon.* In his study of ancient poetic genres, Francis Cairns explains the nature of the *propempticon,* ". . . The primary elements of the propempticon are in these terms someone departing, another person bidding him farewell, and a relationship of affection between the two, plus an appropriate setting." [36] The *propempticon,* then, is a composition in which one says farewell and wishes a safe journey to a departing friend.

Theocritus VII. 52-89 comprises the only extant Greek *propempticon.* In it, Lycidas prays that the Nereids may accompany Ageanax safely to Mytilene, and he tells of the wreaths which he will wear upon his brow when his friend has returned. A number of Latin poems written before the *Silvae* contain elements of the send-off poem. Helvius Cinna addressed a *propempticon* to Pollio on his visit to the East in 56 B.C.[37] In *Odes* I. 3, Horace expresses his wish that Vergil may have a prosperous voyage to Greece. The ode opens with an address to the ship bidding it to carry the poet's beloved friend safely (1-8), and develops at length the commonplace of the dangers of seafaring (9-40). Tibullus I. 3 begins as a send-off poem, with the poet explaining that he cannot accompany Messalla to the East due to illness (1-3), but continues as an expression of Tibullus' fear that he will die while on Corcyra. In the fourth elegy of his third book, Propertius bids Caesar's warships to carry their master safely to Parthia and, in the second half of the poem (11-23), he prays to Mars, Vesta, and Venus to guard the Emperor. In *Amores* II. 26, Ovid laments the fact that Corinna has decided to make a journey by sea, and prays that Nereus and the Zephyrs may protect her.

---

[36] Cairns, 6.
[37] Cinna, frag. 1 Morel.

Menander includes in his Περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν a discussion of *propemptica* detailed in a degree unusual in his work, which suggests that speeches of farewell were frequently delivered in actual practice in his time.[38] According to Menander, *propemptica* are of three varieties, distinguished by the relationship which exists between the addressee and addressant: a superior wishes farewell to an inferior; an equal to an equal; or an inferior to a superior. The attitude which the addressant assumes toward the addressee, and the types of arguments which he adduces, will vary according to his status with regard to the addressee. When the superior bids farewell to the inferior, as when a teacher sends off a student, the tone is advisory (συμβουλευτικόν). When an equal says good-bye to an equal, as in the case of two friends, the tone is friendly and passionately attached. When an inferior sends off a superior, as when citizens bid farewell to their ruler, the tone is predominantly encomiastic.[39]

The examples of the *propempticon* which Menander develops is that of a friend sending off a friend, νέος συνήθης προπέμπων φίλον.[40] In the first section of the *propempticon*, one should mention the example of fast friends, like Theseus and Heracles. One can dwell on the schooling which one shared with the departing friend. The speaker should claim to be stripped bare by the removal of the friend, like Aias without his shield, and might praise animals who live the solitary life. Following such opening τόποι, Menander recommends that the speaker inveigh against the departure, saying that he tried to convince the friend not to leave but failed. The speaker then acquiesces in the departure. Then follows the encomium of the friend's parents, of his city, and of his justice, moderation, wisdom, and courage. The friend is reminded again of the speaker's good will and friendship, and consoled against the pain of separation by friendly recollections and words. If the friend is travelling by sea, one may mention Poseidon, Proteus, Glaucus,

---

[38] Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci*, 3, 395-399.

[39] *Ibid.*, 395.

[40] *Ibid.*, 396.

Nereus, and all the sea gods who will protect the friend at sea. The composition will end with a prayer wishing the friend all the best from the gods.

In *Silvae* III. 2 Statius wishes a safe journey to Maecius Celer who is being sent by Domitian as legatus *ad legionem Syriacam* (Praef. III. 14). In his *propempticon,* Statius reverses the order recommended by Menander by placing his prayer for a safe journey first (1-49). Horace likewise reverses the suggestion of the handbook, whereas Propertius places his prayer last. Menander's second section, the account of the intimate friendship of the addressant and the addressee and of the hardship which the separation will cause the friend left behind is expanded greatly in Statius' poem with a pathetic recounting of the age-old commonplace of the dangers of seafaring (61-100).[41] Statius introduces here familiar pairs of friends whose bond is said to have been more loyal than that of the cowardly Statius who remains behind (96-100). Since Celer was Statius' superior and was on business of the Emperor, there is of course no mention of efforts to dissuade Celer from going, which Statius replaces with a touching portrayal of their sad parting (56-58):

> saevus et e puppi longo clamore magister
> dissipat amplexus atque oscula fida revellit,
> nec longum cara licet in cervice morari.

Although Menander had recommended encomium as an ingredient in all three types of *propempticon* as his sources doubtless had, praise of Celer is restricted to a very few pronouncements and is not contained solely in a distinct section of the composition, as Menander had advised (*Silvae* III. 2. 5-8, 123-128). Encomium is replaced by an address to Egypt asking the land to teach Celer all its arts and history (101-126).

Statius does not fail to include the sea gods Proteus, Triton, and Glaucus (35-37), standard characters in *propemptica,* but in matters of structure and handling of themes, Statius' treatment clearly shows considerable independence of rhetorical theory as it is set down by Menander. Further evidence of Statius' originality in his handling of the *propempticon* is provided by *Silvae* III. 4 *Capilli Flavi Earini*, a full *propempticon* complete with wishes for a safe journey (1-5) and a final prayer (95-106).

---

[41] The commonplace of the dangers of sea travel is as old as Greek literature. Treatments include Hesiod, *Works and Days* 618-694; Sophocles *Antigone* 332-334; Horace *Odes* I. 3. 9-40; Seneca *Medea* 595-624; and Statius *Achilleid* I. 61-65. An extensive treatment of the motif from Hesiod to Thomas Mann is contained in Titus Heydenreich, *Tadel und Lob der Seefahrt: Das Nachleben eines antiken Themas in der romanischen Literatur* (Studien zum Fortwirken der Antike, 5), Heidelberg, 1970.

G. *Soteria*

Silvae I. 4 *Soteria Rutili Gallici* and IV. 2 *Eucharisticon ad Imp. Germ. Domitianum* also bear in the manuscript generic titles not mentioned by Statius in the prose prefaces to Books I and IV. In Greek religious usage, τὰ σωτήρια are the thank offerings or celebrations rendered to a divinity upon the recovery of an individual from illness or danger.[42] *Silvae* I. 4. 127-131 show that Statius intends his verses as a poetic thank offering to the gods upon the recovery of Rutilius Gallicus; this is within the traditions of the Greek σωτήρια:

> qua nunc tibi pauper acerra
> digna litem? nec si vacuet Mevania vallis,
> aut praestent niveos Clitumna novalia tauros,
> sufficiam. sed saepe deis hos inter honores
> caespes et exiguo placuerunt farra salino.

Latin literature contains a number of poems which express thanksgiving upon recovery from illness. In poem XLIV, Catullus thanks his country estate for helping him get rid of a deep cold. The second half of the poem (11-21) is a humorous recounting of how the poet caught cold while reading a frigid speech of Sestius. A more serious example of the genre is Horace *Odes* II. 17, in which the poet explains that his own safety and well-being depend upon the health of Maecenas. Each of the two, he argues, can be thankful that he has recently been snatched from death, and both should offer sacrifices in thanksgiving. *Odes* III. 8 recalls the occasion commemorated in II. 17, for it celebrates the anniversary of the poet's escape from being killed by a falling tree, the near-accident detailed in II. 17. In III. 8, the poet offers up incense and a pure white goat to Liber upon this happy anniversary.

Unfortunately, no extant rhetorical textbook offers a description of the art of the *soteria* so that it is impossible to isolate the commonplaces of the genre and to compare Statius' poem and rhetorical theory. The only element which the examples discussed above have in common is the expression of thanksgiving on the occasion of recovery from illness.

---

[42] "Σωτήρια" (2), *RE* III A, 1, 1221 [Pfister].

H. *Descriptive Poems*

The literary and rhetorical antecedents of those *Silvae* to which neither Statius nor the manuscript tradition specifically assigns a genre may be determined with some degree of accuracy. Nine of the *Silvae* (I. 1, 3, 5, and 6; II. 2 and 3; III. 1; IV. 3 and 6) are in large part descriptions of inanimate objects. *Silvae* I. 1 opens the collection with an ecstatic description of Domitian's equestrian statue set up in the forum in 91 A.D., while I. 3 describes the sumptuous villa of Manilius Vopiscus situated at Tibur. The fifth poem of the first book, in a lighthearted excursion through the elaborate *caldarium* and *frigidarium*, pictures the bathhouse of Claudius Etruscus. The last poem of *Silvae* I details a sumptuous banquet given by Domitian on the occasion of the Saturnalia. *Silvae* II. 2 is Statius' second villa description, delineating the buildings, furnishings, and grounds of the *Villa Surrentina Polli Felicis*. *Silvae* II. 3 is an αἴτιον accounting for the curiously bent shape of the plane tree beside a pool on the estate of Atedius Melior. In III. 1 *Hercules Surrentinus Polli Felicis*, Statius describes the construction of a new temple to Hercules on Pollius' estate. More serious, because addressed to the Emperor, *Silvae* IV. 3 *Via Domitiana* explains, in amazingly technical detail, the laying of a new road to replace the old and dilapidated coastal road from Sinuessa to Naples. The last of the descriptive poems, IV. 6, depicts the statuette of Hercules owned by Novius Vindex.

The use of description in literary works is as old as Western literature and had constituted an important part of epic poetry since Homer. One recalls Homer's portrayal of the shield of Achilles, *Iliad* XVIII. 478-608. The Alexandrians and poets influenced by them were fond of description. An account of a coverlet depicting the sufferings of Ariadne forms the central episode of Catullus LXIV (50-226). Propertius describes Italy in Book III. 22. 17-42, and Ovid describes Sulmona in *Amores* II. 16. 1-11.

The art of description (ἔκφρασις) was one of the preliminary exercises, or προγυμνάσματα, which formed the first level of instruction in the schools of rhetoric. Collections of προγυμνάσματα survive by Aelius Theon, Hermogenes, Nicolaos the Sophist, Aphthonius, and Libanius. Aelius Theon, writing in his *Progymnasmata* composed probably in the first century A.D., defines the ἔκφρασις as a descriptive composition which brings an object vividly before the eyes, Ἔκφρασις ἐστὶ λόγος περιηγηματικὸς ἐναργῶς ὑπ' ὄφιν ἄγων τὸ δηλούμενον.[43] He explains that there are four types of ἐκφράσεις: descriptions of persons (ἐκφράσεις προσώπων), of places (ἐκφράσεις τόπων), of things (ἐκφράσεις πραγμάτων), and of times of year (ἐκφράσεις χρόνων).[44]

In the case of the descriptive *Silvae*, the influence of Vollmer has again been decisive in establishing the opinion among scholars that these poems are mere versified commonplaces. The commentator writes, "Besonders lassen die Gedichte gleichen Inhalts, wie die epicedia, die Lebensbeschreibungen, die Schilderungen von Bauten und Naturschönheiten eine ganz bestimmte Manier der Anordnung und Ausdrucksweise erkennen, die teilweise sicherlich auf die Recepte der Rhetorenschule zurückzuführen ist." [45] Paul Friedländer, in opposition to Vollmer, points out, however, that it is chronologically false to speak of the προγυμνάσματα as models for the descriptive *Silvae* because the description of art objects was not assigned to students of rhetoric as a type of προγύμνασμα until the fourth century A.D., "Das ist chronologisch unmöglich, da, wie sich später herausstellen wird, die Beschreibung eines Kunstwerkes als Progymnasma bis in das vierte Jahrhundert hinein schlechterdings nicht existiert." [46] Further, Friedländer argues, the προγύμνασμα was a beginner's exercise designed to improve the ability of the students to describe, and could therefore hardly have influenced the subject matter and overall form of a literary artwork. He recognizes that the non-descriptive *Silvae* display complex forms to which elements from a number of distinct genres contributed, as we have seen in our discussion of other genres which Statius uses. He feels that it would be unreasonable to maintain that the descriptive poems, any more than the non-descriptive pieces, are of a simple and uniform generic nature, "Denn man darf daran erinnern, dass jene andere Silven, die nicht Beschreibungen enthalten, auch ihrerseits komplizierte Gebilde darstellen, zu deren Entstehen Elegie, Epigramm, Lyrik und Epistel, wenn nicht noch andere Gattungen beigetragen haben, und es ist unwahrscheinlich, dass die Beschreibungen einfacher und einheitlicher Natur sind." [47] To take a specific example, Friedländer notes that there is no evidence that the structure of Statius' two villa descriptions, *Silvae* I. 3 *Villa Tiburtina Manili Vopisci* and II. 2 *Villa Surrentina Polli Felicis*, follows any rhetorical prescriptions, contrary to Vollmer's assertion, "Dass die gleichmässige Anordnung auf die 'Recepte der Rhetorenschule' zurückzuführen sei, dafür gibt es m. W. nicht den Schatten eines Beweises." [48]

---

[43] Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci*, 2, 118.

[44] *Ibid.*

[45] Vollmer, *P. Papinii Statii Silvarum Libri*, 30.

[46] Paul Friedländer, *Johannes von Gaza*, 60-61.

[47] *Ibid.*, 61.

To characterize the descriptive *Silvae* as versified commonplaces is as serious an error as it is so to characterize any group of the collection, and is a misconception which ignores the blend of thematic ingredients which make up the descriptive poems. Statius uses the ἔκφρασις as the vehicle for the extended praise of his friends. As in the other genres in which Statius works, so in his descriptive poems he explodes the boundaries of a single genre and, by a fusion of ingredients from a number of genres and from his observations of the lives of his friends, he succeeds in creating something new and original. In the *Silvae* the excellences of a villa or a bathhouse are fused by Statius with the virtues of the owner, and the splendor and richness of the accoutrements become those of the addressee. Statius' praises of the lovely site of a villa or the fineness of its building materials flow easily into laudatory reflections on the cheerful lifestyle, love of art, and quiet philosophy of his friends. Statius' original achievement in the descriptive *Silvae* consists largely of the fusion of encomium and description in extended poems.[49]

Silvae IV. 2 *Eucharisticon ad Imp. Aug. Germ. Domitianum* was so entitled, whether by Statius or by a later redactor, to indicate the editor's view that the poem is primarily an expression of thanksgiving and only secondarily an ἔκφρασις. In this poem, Statius thanks Domitian for inviting him to a banquet held in the newly-erected *Domus Domitiana.* Expressions of gratitude are confined, however, to verses 1-17 and 57-67. The main body of the poem consists of two ἐκφράσεις of almost exactly equal length, upon the sumptuous palace (18-37) and upon the majestic visage of Domitian (38-56).

I. *Other Poems*

The tone of flattery which characterizes the *eucharisticon* is prominent as well in *Silvae* IV. 1 *Septimus Decimus Consulatus Imp. Aug. Germanici*, in which Statius offers congratulations to

---

[48] *Ibid.*, 66 note 3.

[49] Hanna Szelest makes this point at length in "Die Originalität der sog. beschreibenden *Silvae* des Statius," *Eos* 56 (1966 [1969]), 196.

Domitian on the assumption of his seventeenth consulship on January 1, 95 A.D. The closest poetic parallels to *Silvae* IV. 1 are probably the anonymous encomia *Panegyricus Messalae* and *Laus Pisonis*. Like *Silvae* IV. 1, these compositions congratulate their addressees upon their incomparable talents and remind the world of its good fortune in possessing such men. They differ from the *eucharisticon* in being intended for no specific political occasion and containing no mythological framework.

The rhetorical background for his *eucharisticon* is, however, readily ascertained. The subject of the poem and the tone of panegyric prevalent throughout the poem place it in the tradition of what the handbooks of rhetoric term the βασιλικὸς λόγος, or royal panegyric. The most complete extant discussion of this type of composition is contained in Menander's Περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν.[50] The βασιλικὸς λόγος, according to Menander, is an encomium on a king, consisting of a magnification of his virtues, ʽΟ βασιλικὸς λόγος ἐγκώμιόν ἔστι βασιλέως, οὐκοῦν αὔξησιν ὁμολογουμένην περιέξει τῶν προσόντων ἀγαθῶν βασιλεῖ.[51]

The royal panegyric should begin, he states, with a προοίμιον in which the addressant says that the king's accomplishments are unparallelled, as much so as the sea is boundless. His words and good fortune should be praised in a general way. After this introduction, the praise is directed to the king's homeland (πατρίς). If it is noble, one praises the entire country; if not, some particular virtue of the land is singled out for praise. One can say that, as in the case of Heracles, the king is a god-child. When the writer next turns to speak of the king's nature (φύσις), he may recount miracles attendant upon the king's birth and upbringing. The praises of the king's soul (ψυχή) should include encomium on any special advantages of education or personal abilities, like a love of learning (φιλομαθία) or martial vigor. A large section should then be devoted to the king's deeds (πράξεις), first those of peace and then those of war. The particular virtues to be singled out are courage (ἀνδρεία), justice (δικαιοσύνη), moderation (σωφροσύνη), and prudence (φρόνησις). The author should compare the king's rule to that of former kings and acknowledge that his is greater than former kingships. In the final section, the ἐπίλογος, the good fortune and happiness of the king's subjects are underlined. One argues that reverence for the gods has increased under his reign. Finally the writer offers up a prayer for the king, asking that he be preserved and that, when the time comes, the rulership be turned over to his children.

---

[50] Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci*, 3, 368-377.

[51] *Ibid.*, 368.

Silvae IV. 1 begins with an expression of thanks that Domitian has agreed to assume the consulship (1-16), and the bulk of the poem (17-43) consists of an address by Janus (who begins the year with Domitian) to the Emperor. The god asserts that Domitian causes mid-winter to grow warmer (24), perhaps an example of the miracles suggested by Menander, and Janus claims that in number of consulships Domitian far outstripped Augustus, and, indeed, outshone his own ancestors even as a boy (31-33):

> ter Latio deciesque tulit labentibus annis
> Augustus fascis, sed coepit sero mereri:
> tu iuvenis praegressus avos.

When Janus has finished his address, all the gods fling wide the doors of their temples to show their assent to his prayers (44-47).

If *Silvae* IV. 1 seems to reflect some of the thematic elements prescribed by the handbooks, the structure of the poem is in no way like that of the βασιλικὸς λόγος as Menander outlines it. As often in the *Silvae,* a god delivers the main address, a device which Statius uses to indicate the interest shown by the gods in the addressees of his poems. Statius' praise is generalized and diffused throughout the poem, and most of the categories of panegyric suggested by Menander are absent from it.

As in *Silvae* IV. 1, encomium forms the chief component of *Silvae* V. 2 *Laudes Crispini Vetti Bolani Fili,* in which Statius congratulates the sixteen-year-old Crispinus upon his appointment as military tribune. As is true of many of the *Silvae,* this poem, although primarily representative of one genre, the panegyric, includes thematic elements from others. The praise of the subject's virtues and predictions for his glorious future form the bulk of the poem (8-124), while sections of the piece (125-131, 168-180) are protreptic, exhorting the lad to go forth to meet his task and prove himself equal to his father Bolanus and to the glorious career which the divine Emperor is preparing for him.

Silvae IV. 7 *Ode Lyrica ad Vibium Maximum,* written in Sapphics, and *Silvae* IV. 5 *Ode Lyrica ad Septimium Severum,* in Alcaics, are the sole examples of lyric meters in the Horatian manner in Statius' poetry. In IV. 5, Statius greets his eloquent friend Septimus and, contrasting his own humble circumstances with Septimius' might, asks for his friend's support and continued friendship. The poet explains that the poem is a metrical experiment, for he tells Septimius that he greets him in an unwonted mode, *non solitis fidibus* (4). The choice of a lyric meter is a compliment to his friend who, as the poet tells us in line 60, was a lyric poet himself. The basic contrast between Statius' humble fortunes and Septimius' lordly estate is closely related to the contrast between Grosphus' wealth and Horace's lowly farm which forms the subject of *Ode* II. 16 of Horace. Statius explains that he does not have a thousand animals roaming his lands (*Silvae* IV. 5. 17-20):

> non mille balant lanigeri greges,
> nec vacca dulci mugit adultero,
>   unique siquando canenti
>   mutus ager domino reclamat.

The relation to Horace is obvious (*Odes* II. 16. 33-35):

> te greges centum Siculaeque circum
> mugiunt vaccae, tibi tollit hinnitum
> apta quadrigis equa. . . ,

yet here, as often in the *Silvae*, Statius differs from the earlier poet in his constant emphasis upon his need for friendship and support and in his persistent flattery of those whose friendship he seeks to retain.

The literary antecedents of *Silvae* IV. 9 *Hendecasyllabi Iocosi ad Plotium Grypum* are also easily traceable. In this lighthearted poem, written on the occasion of the Saturnalia, Statius chides his friend Grypus for sending him a mouldering volume of Brutus' speeches in return for a fine and expensive volume of his own poems which the poet had sent him. The motif of scolding a friend for a cheap gift sent during the Saturnalia recalls Catullus XIV in which Catullus rebukes Calvus for sending him an anthology of wretched contemporary verse. Statius has also borrowed the hendecasyllabic meter from Catullus but, while Catullus satisfies himself with a mock curse on Calvus and some literary criticism, Statius includes a list of twenty-seven worthless gifts which he would have preferred to Brutus' dusty orations (23-45).

Our generic classification of the poems in the *Silvae* and comparison of the poems in the collection with all extant rhetorical treatises which offer suggestions for compositions in the genres included in the *Silvae* yield some significant results. The influence of treatises of this nature, which Statius might have read while a student, upon the subject matter and structure of the *Silvae* has generally been considered to be substantial. Critics like Vollmer and

Ribbeck have stated, with little supportive evidence and virtually no direct comparison between the prescriptions of the handbooks and the poems of the *Silvae*, that Statius' entire technique in his occasional poetry consists of turning into verse the commonplaces which he found in these handbooks. Comparison of Statius' practice with the recommendations of the handbooks shows, however, that contrary to the assertions of these scholars, the influence of the handbooks has been considerably exaggerated in the matter of the choice of thematic material and structure. It is undeniable that some of the recommendations of such rhetorical handbooks are reflected in the subject matter which Statius has incorporated into the *Silvae*, and we have noted such instances. It was inevitable that compositions framed in poetic genres for which numerous rhetorical and poetic precedents existed should to some extent mirror the established commonplaces of these genres. Statius' poems reproduce the commonplaces of some genres because in these types only so many variations are possible. The consolations which one can offer to a friend who has lost a loved one are, after all, limited in number.

In matters of content, Statius shows his independence of the prescriptions of handbooks in several ways. The example of *Silvae* II. 7 *Genethliacon Lucani ad Pollam* demonstrates that Statius could fuse the material of unrelated genres into a striking new poetic whole. In I. 2 *Epithalamium in Stellam et Violentillam* he has combined commonplaces of elegiac poetry with those of wedding poems. He also introduces new elements into old genres, a technique most impressively shown in his handling of *Silvae* III. 4 *Capilli Flavi Earini*, in which locks of hair become the addressee of a *propempticon*. In III. 2, Statius reverses the suggestions of the handbooks by beginning, instead of ending, his composition with a prayer, and in IV. 1 *Septimus Decimus Consulatus Imp. Aug. Germanici* a number of prerequisites of the encomium are omitted entirely.

Our examination of the handbooks of rhetoric has shown as well that Statius could have derived only the most general guidelines from them in the matter of structure. Insofar as the handbooks of rhetoric discuss structure at all, their comments are limited to suggestions that certain thematic elements should come in the proem or that one element should follow another. Such suggestions are hardly substantial enough to serve as useful structural guidelines. We have observed repeatedly, however, that Statius ignores even these general suggestions.

CHAPTER THREE

STRUCTURE IN ANCIENT POETIC COLLECTIONS

In the first half of this chapter, we assemble and evaluate the evidence which the *Silvae* provide on the question of their circulation and publication. In the remainder of the chapter, we examine a number of devices which were commonly used by ancient poets in structuring their poetic collections. It is important in assessing both Statius' conception of a finished poetic work and the distribution and responsion of themes over the span of the published books, to determine how many books of the *Silvae* were issued as a unit. The evidence available, derived wholly from the prose prefaces, is, however, scanty, and has been variously interpreted in the past. A reexamination of Statius' pronouncements on the publication of the collection will throw some light on the vexed question of how many books of the *Silvae* appeared as a unit during the poet's lifetime.

Philologists have detected a number of structural principles at work in ancient poetic collections. A review of these principles will indicate what structural devices had been tried by poets prior to Statius and will aid us to assess Statius' use of each. These devices may be divided into two groups which we may term external and internal structuring devices. External structuring devices, whether they are employed in the construction of single poems or whole books of poems, are those whose employment can be detected without close examination of the contents of the poems in question, for instance: structuring by chronology, by metrical variation, and by alternation of poem length. Real understanding of a poet's compositional art is impossible, however, without examination of his ideas and themes and of their placement in his work. This internal structural principle, which may be termed thematic structuring, seeks to determine how the poet organizes similar and contrasting ideas within a poem and develops his themes in the course of the one or more books of his poetic collection. In this chapter we discuss both external and internal structuring devices in poetic collections written before the *Silvae* and assess Statius' use of external structural principles in the *Silvae*.

Several times in the prefaces to the books of the *Silvae,* Statius speaks of the circulation of the individual poems. In the preface to Book I, he writes that he long hesitated before gathering the poems of the *Silvae* for publication, *Diu multumque dubitavi, Stella iuvenis optime et in studiis nostris eminentissime qua parte et voluisti, an hos libellos, qui mihi subito calore et quadam festinandi voluptate fluxerunt, cum singuli de sinu meo pro <fugissent>, congregatos ipse dimitterem* (Praef. I. 1-5). Later in the preface he argues that it is too late to try to hold the poems back, since they are already in the hands of those for whom they were intended, *quid? quod haec serum erat continere, cum illa vos certe quorum honori data sunt haberetis?* (Praef. I. 10-12). In the preface to Book II, Statius argues that the very nature of the *Silvae* as occasional pieces inspired by specific circumstances demanded their circulation prior to publication. While apologizing to his friend Melior for sending him the *consolatio* on the death of his favorite Glaucias when Melior's grief was still fresh, Statius emphasizes that a consolation is useless if not delivered when the pain is at its height. To be of help, the poem must be a *carmen . . . a confuso scriptum et dolenti datum* (Praef. II. 11-12), and should have been written and delivered while both Statius and Melior were beset by grief. Some of the poems in the collection, Statius stresses, would have lost their effect if they had not been delivered at once, *eandem exigebat stili facilitatem leo mansuetus, quem in amphitheatro prostratum frigidum erat sacratissimo Imperatori ni statim traderem* (Praef. II. 17-19). Finally, in the preface to Book IV, Statius states that, for him, presentation of a number of the *Silvae* to the Emperor before publication is an honor greater than publication itself, *deinde multa ex illis iam domino Caesari dederam, et quanto hoc plus est quam edere?* (Praef. IV. 28-30).

It is easier to establish the fact that a number of the *Silvae* circulated among Statius' friends before he assembled them for publication than it is to determine the circumstances concerning the publication of the collection. To some extent, the difficulty in interpreting the information which Statius gives us concerning the publication of his occasional poetry is caused by uncertainty as to the meaning which he attaches to the word *opusculum* in his discussion of the publication of the *Silvae* (Praef. IV. 2-3). This question has been repeatedly investigated by Statian scholars.

The earliest treatment of the question is found in the Introduction to Friedrich Vollmer's commentary on the *Silvae.* Vollmer argues that Statius published Books I-III as a unit, basing his conclusion on Statius' claim in the preface to Book IV never to have begun a work without invoking the godhead of the Emperor, *reor equidem aliter quam invocato numine maximi imperatoris nullum opusculum meum coepisse* (Praef. IV. 2-3).[1] *Thebaid* I. 16-33 and *Achilleid* I. 14-19 address Domitian; Statius' epic works may thus, Vollmer reasons, be said to begin with an invocation of the mighty Emperor's godhead, *invocato numine maximi imperatoris. Silvae* I. 1 likewise contains an address to Domitian but Statius does not again begin a book of the *Silvae* with an invocation of the Emperor until *Silvae* IV. 1, the poem on Domitian's seventeenth consulship. *Silvae* I-III must therefore, in Vollmer's judgment, be considered as a single *opusculum.* He further defends his view by noting that the prefaces to Books I-III ask for a tolerant reception for the *Silvae,* while that to Book IV implies that hostile criticism had greeted the poems which had appeared. This criticism, the poet explains, led him to include more poems in Book IV than in the previous books, in defiance of those who find fault with the sort of poetry contained in the collection, *quare ergo plura in quarto Silvarum quam in prioribus? ne se putent aliquid egisse qui reprehenderunt, ut audio, quod hoc stili genus edidissem* (Praef. IV. 25-27). Vollmer's arguments for the publication of Books I-III as a unit were later substantially restated by Léon Legras who argued that Statius' use of *opusculum* to refer to his epics was a sign of modesty.[2]

Walter Härtel, in his Leipzig dissertation, devoted a chapter to a discussion of the publication of the first three books of the *Silvae.* He argued that Vollmer was wrong to conclude that Books I-III were issued together because of Statius' comment *reor equidem aliter quam invocato numine maximi imperatoris nullum opusculum meum coepisse,* since Statius would hardly refer to either the *Thebaid* or the *Achilleid* as an *opusculum.* One cannot conclude, Härtel argues, merely from the fact that Statius makes this statement in the preface to Book IV that Books I-III appeared together. Härtel's conclusions are negative, "Id autem ab initio dicam verbis illis, quippe quae a nobis iam non possint plane intellegi, nullo modo esse nitendum." [3] In Härtel's view, the difference in tone between the prefaces to Books I-III and IV does not necessarily indicate anything about the publication of the books.

---

[1] Vollmer, *P. Papinii Statii Silvarum Libri,* 11-12.

[2] Léon Legras, "Les Dernières Années de Stace," *REA* 9 (1907), 338-348; 10 (1908), 34-70. Legras' discussion of Statius' use of the word *opusculum* occurs in *REA* 9 (1907), 341.

[3] Walter Härtel, *Studia Statiana* (Dissertation, Leipzig, 1900), 6-7.

In 1930, Henri Frère took up this vexed issue again, arguing that, although Statius often mentions and addresses Domitian in the *Silvae* and repeatedly invokes gods, he does not in fact invoke Domitian in any of his works, epic or occasional. Domitian is never called upon to inspire or guide the poet. *Opusculum*, according to Frère, refers to the individual poems in the collection. When the poet speaks of an invocation of Domitian (*invocato numine maximi imperatoris*), he does not refer to any published prayer for aid or protection, but rather to an oral prayer offered before the composition of each poem. The passage in the preface to the *Silvae* deals, then, not with the publication of the *Silvae* but with Emperor worship, "Et si le texte de Stace doit nous apprendre quelque chose, ce n'est pas sur la publication des Silves, mais sur le culte officieux des empereurs." [4]

Härtel's objection that Statius would not have termed his epic labors *opuscula* is well taken. When, in the preface to Book I, Statius excuses his indulgence in light occasional poetry (Praef. I. 7-10), he is writing as an epic poet who fears that such poetic activity may be considered beneath the dignity of the epic writer. For this reason he quotes Vergil and Homer, whose epic dignity no one questioned, as examples of poets who relaxed from their epic labors by composing lighter types of verse. *Opuscula* is not the word which a poet so jealous of his reputation as an epic poet as was Statius would choose to designate his heroic poetry. Vollmer's argument that Books I-III were published as a unit is weakened by the liberties which he must take with the meaning of *invocato* to extract the sense which he requires. He mistakes for an invocation what is in fact an address to the Emperor. Yet the radical difference in tone between the prefaces to I-III and that of IV does suggest that I-III were issued as a unit. Statius is always solicitous of his reputation and eager for approval. Had *Silvae* I or II been poorly received, one would expect a reference to this in the preface to II or III. It is unlikely that the *Silvae* would have met with unfavorable criticism only after three books had been published separately. It is probable, therefore, that no mention is made of unfavorable criticism before the preface to *Silvae* IV because the appearance of

---

[4] Henri Frère "Stace, *Silvae* IV Praef., 5 suiv. K," in *Mélanges Paul Thomas*, Bruges, 1930, 311.

Book IV was the first opportunity which the poet had to refer to such criticism since his last publication, namely the issuance, as a unit, of *Silvae* I-III.

All evidence indicates that Book V of the *Silvae* was organized and published after the death of Statius. While Books I-IV are each preceded by a prose preface which lists all the poems to be found in the several books and explains the reasons for their composition, the brief epistle which precedes Book V concerns only *Silvae* V. 1 *Epicedion in Priscillam <Abascanti> Uxorem.* In contrast to the prose prefaces, it does not speak in general terms of the poet's friendship with the recipient of the book and of the circumstances which led to the dedication to that friend, but discusses the reason why Abascantus' *pietas* toward his wife has called forth the *epicedion* from Statius. The epistle has the appearance, not of a general preface meant to come before the entire book, but of a personal letter dispatched to Abascantus along with the newly-written *epicedion.* Further, the last poem of Book V as it stands, the *Epicedion in Puerum Suum,* breaks off after an introduction of 65 verses in the course of the formal *laudatio* which, as we will see below,[5] is the second of the four regular divisions to which Statius adheres in the composition of his *epicedia.* The truncated form of the poem and its variance from a structual pattern from which Statius otherwise never departs seems to indicate that the poem was left unfinished at the poet's death.

Since it appears that *Silvae* I-III were published together, and all evidence shows that *Silvae* V was issued posthumously by a redactor from previously unpublished poems, *Silvae* IV must have been issued separately by Statius himself.

Philologists have long recognized that the careful structuring of poems and poetic books was a major concern of Greek and Roman poets, a concern fostered in ancient writers and their critics by training in the schools of rhetoric. The correct disposition of the parts of a speech is discussed in every extant treatise on rhetoric.[6] The training which they received in the schools of rhetoric made the ancients sensitive critics of the structure of poetic works. In his commentary on the first line of *Eclogue* III of Vergil, for example, the grammarian Servius discussed the order of the ten poems of Vergil's bucolic collection and concluded that variation of narrative form was the principle underlying the order of the poems. He stressed that, above all, *variatio* was the goal of the writer of eclogues, *qui enim bucolica scribit, curare debet ante omnia, ne similes sibi sint eclogae.* Servius explains that the bucolic poet should achieve this goal by including in his collection pieces written in the three conceivable narrative forms: that in which the poet speaks, as in the *Georgics*; that in which the poet does not speak but has his characters speak, as occurs in comedies and tragedies; and the third form in which both the poet and introduced characters speak, as in the *Aeneid*. The *Eclogues*, the commentator continues, contain examples of all these types. In *Eclogues* IV and VI, the poet speaks; in I, III, V, VII, and IX, dialogue form is used in which the poet never speaks; in II, VIII, and X, the poet and persons whom he introduces speak. Servius' analysis is simple and is based upon Aristotle's discussion of classifications of narrative,[7] but it shows a recognition of the fact that structure was a concern of ancient poets.

---

[5] See Chapter IV, 64.

[6] See, for example, Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1414a-1420a; Cicero *De Inventione* I. 19 and 31-33, and *Partitiones Oratoriae* 27-52; *Ad Herennium* I. 3 and III. 9; Quintilian III. 9. 1 and IV. 5. 1-25.

The principle of organization in the *Eclogues* which Servius analyzes, variation of narrative form, is a structural device which can be detected without examination of the themes and ideas of the poems themselves. The ancients made considerable use of such external structuring devices, prominent among which are the arrangement of poems by date of composition, by metrical variation, and by alternation and grouping of poems of similar or contrasting length.

The simplest device which a poet can use to organize a number of poems into a book is to follow a chronological order, placing poems composed at an earlier date before those composed later. Yet ancient poems frequently offer us no sure means for dating them. The widely divergent views of scholars on the dating of Greek and Roman works demonstrate the difficulty in arguing for chronology as an ordering principle in ancient poetic collections. For example, in his discussion of the chronology of the *Epodes* of Horace, Robert Carrubba quotes the dates of composition of the poems as these were suggested by five scholars in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The dating suggested for any given

---

[7] Aristotle, *Poetics* 1448a.

Epode often varied by several years from scholar to scholar. Some denied that Horace used any chronological principle in the ordering of the *Epodes*, while others argued that a partial chronological sequence could be detected. Because of this complete lack of agreement on the dating of the poems, Carrubba firmly rejects chronology as an ordering principle in the *Epodes*.[8]

Arrangement by metrical variation is more readily verifiable than is ordering by date of composition. The use of structuring by variation of meter is demonstrated by the *Epodes* of Horace. *Epodes* I-X are written totally in iambics, XI-XVI employ alternating lines of iambs and dactyls, and XVII once again employs iambs alone. On the basis of the pronounced use of variation of meter as a structuring device in the *Epodes*, Wilhelm Port, in his study of the structural techniques of Augustan poetic collections, concluded that meter was the sole organizing principle in the work.[9] Robert Carrubba has shown, however, that thematic structuring in the *Epodes*, in the form of careful juxtaposition and separation of poems of like and contrasting theme, is a structural device of much greater importance than is meter in the organization of the *Epodes*.[10]

Alternation of long and short poems, or grouping together of several poems of similar length may be employed simultaneously with other ordering principles in a poetic collection. The longest of Vergil's *Eclogues*, III and VIII, directly precede the shortest, IV and IX. The briefest satires of Horace's Book I, poems VII and VIII, stand together.

The structural principles discussed so far function independently of the content of the poems and poetic books in which they figure. The investigation of internal, or thematic structure, has most consistently occupied the attention of philologists and has yielded the most interesting and significant results. Port has drawn a number of conclusions on the thematic organization of Augustan poetic books, based on his investigation of the works of Vergil, Horace, Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid. He noted a tendency among these poets to place programmatic poems, composed shortly before publication of a poetic collection, at the beginning and end of books. Such poems, when placed at the beginning of books, form a dedication to the collection or contain an apology for the genre employed in the work.[11] Poems which stand last in Augustan poetic collections often bear a direct thematic connection to the first poems of the book and contain further justification for the genre employed in the work.[12] As examples of poetic books whose opening and closing pieces bear close thematic connections, Port cites Horace's *Odes* I. 1. and III. 30, Propertius' Book I. 1 and I. 22, and Ovid's *Ex Ponto* I. 1 and III. 9, and he notes Horace's *Satires* I. 10 and Propertius' Book II. 34 as examples of apologies expressed in the concluding poem of a collection for the genre employed in the work. Frequently in Augustan poetic collections the poet speaks in his own person in the final poem of a book, as in Vergil's *Eclogue* X, or Horace's *Odes* II. 20 and III. 30, and *Satires* I. 10. More lighthearted and less programmatic poems, like Vergil's *Eclogue* IX and Horace's *Satires* I. 7 and 8, tend to be placed in positions between the beginning, middle, and end in Augustan poetic collections.[13]

---

[8] Robert Carrubba, *The Epodes of Horace: A Study in Poetic Arrangement* (Studies in Classical Literature, 9), The Hague, 1969, 15-17.

[9] Wilhelm Port, "Die Anordnung in Gedichtbüchern augusteischer Zeit," *Philologus* 81 (1926), 295.

[10] Carrubba, 22-83.

Port has further noted that Augustan poetic books are frequently divided into symmetrical halves. According to Port's analysis, Vergil's *Eclogues* admirably illustrate this principle. *Eclogue* V ends the first half of the book with a glance back to *Eclogues* II and III, while *Eclogue* VI begins the second half of the book by its invocation of the Muses.[14]

In books containing relatively few poems, Port argues, including the *Eclogues* of Vergil, the *Satires* of Horace, and Book I of Tibullus, poems of like content tend to be as widely separated as possible. *Eclogues* I and IX, dealing with land confiscations, stand as far from each other as was possible, since the reference in the opening verse of *Eclogue* X to its status as Vergil's last bucolic production (*extremum laborem*) secures for it the final position in the collection.

---

[11] Port, 457, "Das Einleitungsgedicht enthält die Widmung des Buches und ist gewissermassen ein Programgedicht, das auf den Inhalt der ganzen Sammlung vorbereitet, oder es enthält eine Rechtfertigung oder Verteidigung der Gedichtsgattung."

[12] *Ibid.*, "Die Schlussgedichte stehen oft in direkter Beziehung zum Einleitungsgedicht. . . . Auch in ihnen findet sich gelegentlich eine Rechtfertigung der Gedichtsgattung."

[13] *Ibid.*, 458.

[14] *Ibid.*, 288.

Studies written since the appearance of Port's article have shown that the structural pattern especially favored by writers throughout antiquity for the arrangement of their ideas in individual poems and poetic books is what George Duckworth, in his study of structural patterns in Vergil's *Aeneid*, describes as "... a concentric or recessed panel pattern with balancing passages framing a central focal point." [15] He plots the recessed panel structure of *Eclogue* I:

1-5	Introduction	(5 verses)
6-26	Good fortune of Tityrus	(21 verses)
27-39	Tityrus in Rome	(13 verses)
40-45	Benefits from the youth	(6 verses)
46-58	Tityrus at home	(13 verses)
59-78	Plight of Meliboeus	(20 verses)
79-83	Conclusion	(5 verses).[16]

Remarkable in Duckworth's analysis is the almost exact numerical balance in the total of verses in the corresponding sections of the poem. Sections of contrasting but closely related subject matter frame a central episode (40-45) to which the poet calls particular attention by assigning it to the thematic and physical center of the poem. Recessed panel structure is used not only in individual *Eclogues*, but, according to Duckworth, is the principle upon which the ten poems of the collection are organized into a book:

- I Country life; confiscation of territory
  - II Song of love
    - III Responsive singing match; no decision
      - IV World to come; religion and philosophy
        - V Shepherd becomes a god
      - VI World that was; philosophy and mythology
    - VII Responsive singing match; decision
  - VIII Two songs of love
- IX Country life; confiscation of territory
        - X Friend becomes a shepherd.[17]

The use of recessed panel structure in poetic works antedates Vergil by many centuries. Cedric Whitman, who considers the device to be a primary characteristic of Geometric art,[18] has explored its employment in Homer. He sees the *Iliad* as a vast recessed panel, or concentric circle, structure, "The poem as a whole forms one large concentric pattern, within which a vast system of smaller ones, sometimes distinct and sometimes interlocking, gives shape to the separate parts." [19] The thematic basis of Book I, quarrel, is balanced in Book XXIV by its opposite, reconciliation. Book II portrays the heroic world in chaos, while Book XXIII shows this world in order. In the middle of a perfectly balanced series of recessed panel structures stands the central panel of the epic, the battle which occupies Books XI-XV.

---

[15] George E. Duckworth, *Structural Patterns and Proportions in Vergil's Aeneid: A Study in Mathematical Composition*, Ann Arbor, 1962, 21.

[16] *Ibid.*

[17] *Ibid.*, 3.

[18] Cedric H. Whitman, *Homer and the Heroic Tradition*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1958, 97. Whitman was not the first to detect recessed panel structuring in Homer. His work is chosen here as an example of this area of structural study because of its particularly full exposition of the concept.

Recessed panel structuring was of course not the sole thematic pattern which Greek and Roman poets used in structuring poems and poetic books. Recessed panel structure may be said to exhibit the thematic pattern ABCBA. A second common pattern used by ancient poets in constructing both individual poems and whole poetic books may be termed parallel or alternating structure, exhibiting the thematic form ABABAB.

Parallel or alternating structure is one of the devices which contribute to the manifold and varied thematic organization of Vergil's *Aeneid*, which Duckworth has analyzed in detail.

The regular alternation between books of intensely emotional and philosophically significant theme and books of a more relaxed theme demonstrates one aspect of the use of parallel structure in the epic. After the relatively low-key opening book of the *Aeneid*, in which only the storm scene reaches a high emotional level, Aeneas offers an affecting account of the destruction of Troy in Book II.

Earlier treatments of the topic include J. T. Sheppard, *The Pattern of the Iliad*, London, 1922, and J. L. Myres, "The Last Book of the *Iliad*," *JHS* 52 (1932), 264-296.

Although the presence of recessed panel structure in a number of ancient poetic works is generally acknowledged by scholars, its origin is debated. Clyde Murley, "The Structure and Proportion of Catullus LXIV," *TAPhA* 68 (1937), 308, considers recessed panel structure to be a particularly Roman way of organizing thought, "It is elaborately chiastic like such a periodic sentence as: ^{a}Dei ^{b}qui antequam ^{c}homines iniusti ^{c}facti sunt eos ^{b}convenerant postea ^{a}deseruerunt. As such it was typically Roman, whereas the Alexandrian order was linear and looser." Duckworth, *Structural Patterns and Proportions*, 22, argues, however, that recessed panel construction is much older than Roman times, "Actually it is neither specifically Roman nor Hellenistic but should be viewed as a fundamental method of ancient composition; it goes back to Homer where it is termed 'ring composition' or 'geometric structure.' "

[19] Whitman, 97.

The relaxed tenor evident in the greater part of Book I returns in Aeneas' tale of the wanderings of his men which forms the subject matter of Book III. The love story of Dido and Aeneas in Book IV brings the tension to a new height, which the slackened emotion of the games in Book V relieves once again. Book VI, with its revelations of the future of Rome and the touching meeting of Aeneas and Anchises, reattains the emotional level of Book IV. At the same time, the poem is divided into two thematic halves, the first of which details Aeneas' journey from Troy to Latium (I-VI), and the second of which describes his adventures in Latium (VII-XII). The books of the first half bear close thematic links to those in the second half. In Books I and VII, for example, the hero arrives in a strange land and accepts hospitality, while in XII Aeneas carries out the commission which he had received in VI. The poem reveals as well a thematic division into three groups of four books. Duckworth calls the first four books the "Tragedy of Dido," the second four the "Destiny of Rome," and the last four the "Tragedy of Turnus." [20]

In examining Statius' use of the three external structuring devices outlined earlier in the chapter, chronological ordering, metrical variation, and alternation of long and short poems, we find chronology of little help in accounting for the organization of the poems and books of the *Silvae*. This problem is particularly acute in the case of the *Silvae* because of the personal and intimate nature of the subject matter of many poems in the collection. Frequently the events with which Statius deals would not readily be mentioned either in datable inscriptions or in the writings of other poets. Thus *Silvae* I. 3 *Villa Tiburtina Manili Vopisci*, I. 6 *Kalendae Decembres*, II. 1 *Glaucias Atedi Melioris Delicatus*, II. 3 *Arbor Atedi Melioris*, II. 4 *Psittacus Eiusdem*, II. 5 *Leo Mansuetus*, III. 2 *Propempticon Maecio Celeri*, V. 3 *Epicedion in Patrem Suum*, and V. 4 *Somnus* contain no allusion to events in Rome or in Statius' life which are accurately datable. On the other hand, *Silvae* IV. 1 was written to commemorate Domitian's seventeenth consulship, which he assumed on January 1, 95 A.D. *Silvae* IV. 2 celebrates a dinner to which Statius was invited in the new *domus Domitiana* which was completed before 93 A.D. If we assume that IV. 2 was written to commemorate the opening of Domitian's new house, its composition could have preceded that of IV. 1 by two years. Since Statius makes no mention in IV. 2 of such an occasion for the composition of the poem, it may, on the other hand, have followed IV. 1 by several months. *Silvae* IV. 4 furnishes a second example of chronological difficulties in the collection. *Silvae* IV. 4. 12-13 indicate that the poem was written in summer:

---

[20] Duckworth, 13.

iam terras volucremque polum fuga veris aquosi
laxat et Icariis caelum latratibus urit.

The next poem in the collection was composed in the spring (IV. 5. 9-12):

nunc cuncta veris frondibus annuis
crinitur arbos, nunc volucrum novi
  questus inexpertumque carmen,
    quod tacita statuere bruma.[21]

If these poems were written in the same year, the order of their inclusion in the book contradicts the order of their composition. As in the case of the *Epodes* of Horace, uncertainty of dating renders chronology useless as a means for analyzing the arrangement of the poems in the *Silvae.*

Structuring by meter plays a distinct, if secondary, role in the *Silvae.* The collection contains examples of a number of meters. Twenty-six of the thirty-two poems are composed in hexameters. Poems I. 6 *Kalendae Decembres*, II. 7 *Genethliacon Lucani ad Pollam*, IV. 3 *Via Domitiana*, and IV. 9 *Hendecasyllabi Iocosi ad Plotium Grypum* are written in hendecasyllables. IV. 5 *Ode Lyrica ad Septimium Severum* is in Alcaics, and Sapphics are employed in IV. 7 *Ode Lyrica ad Vibium Maximum. Silvae* I. 6 and II. 7, the final poems of their books, are the sole examples of hendecasyllables in these books, which suggests that Statius used the meter, so rare in the *Silvae,* to mark the end of structural units.

All the poems in *Silvae* III are hexametric and the book thus differs from Books I and II, each of which ends with a poem in hendecasyllables. The metrical structure of Books I and II otherwise resembles that of Book III in that all the hexametric poems in the two earlier books stand together and form a metrical block of poems.

Book IV stands in marked contrast to the comparative metrical uniformity of *Silvae* I-III. The metrical contrast between *Silvae* I-III and IV furnishes another argument in support of our hypothesis that *Silvae* I-III appeared as a unit. It is noteworthy that hendecasyllables are used in IV. 3 *Via Domitiana*, the last poem in a series of three poems whose subject is the Emperor. The meter is used here, as in the final poems of *Silvae* I and II, to mark the end of a number of poems which the poet conceives as forming a distinct group. Just as a hendecasyllabic poem indicates that Book I and Book II are ended, so *Silvae* IV. 3 indicates that a series of Domitianic poems is ended. In the remaining poems of *Silvae* IV, Statius observes a regular alternation of lyric meters and hexameters:

---

[21] I am adopting M's reading *veris* against Phillimore's *vernans* which he borrows from Markland.

IV. 4 hexameters
IV. 5 Alcaics
IV. 6 hexameters
IV. 7 Sapphics
IV. 8 hexameters
IV. 9 hendecasyllables.

It is clear, then, that variation of meter plays a part in the organization of the *Silvae* which is comparable to the role of meter in the structure of the *Epodes* of Horace. As in the *Epodes*, it contributes to a complex blend of external and thematic ordering principles.

Alternation of poem length also plays a role in the ordering of the *Silvae*. The longest poem of Book I, *Silvae* I. 2 *Epithalamium in Stellam et Violentillam*, stands between two poems of much briefer but almost equal compass, I. 1 *Equs Maximus Domitiani Imperatoris* (107 verses) and I. 3 *Villa Tiburtina Polli Felicis* (110 verses). The second longest poem of the book, I. 4 *Soteria Rutili Gallici*, containing 131 verses, is followed by two brief poems, I. 5 *Balneum Claudi Etrusci* and I. 6 *Kalendae Decembres*, which contain together 167 verses, a verse total comparable to the length of I. 4. Statius' use of this device is more striking in *Silvae* II. In the preface to Book II, Statius calls II. 3 *Arbor Atedi Melioris*, II. 4 *Psittacus Eiusdem*, and II. 5 *Leo Mansuetus* poems written in an epigrammatic style, *libellos quasi epigrammatis loco scriptos* (Praef. II. 16-17), and, as brief poems of like style, he has grouped them together. These three poems contain a total of 144 verses which makes them, taken together, comparable in length to II. 2 *Consolatio ad Flavium Ursum de Amissione Pueri Delicati* which has 155 verses and to II. 7 *Genethliacon Lucani ad Pollam* which contains 135. The first and last poems of Book II are in each case longer than the pieces which stand beside them (II. 1 *Glaucias Atedi Melioris Delicatus* = 234 verses; II. 2 *Villa Surrentina Polli Felicis* = 155 verses; II. 6

Consolatio ad Flavium Ursum de Amissione Pueri Delicati = 105 verses; II. 7 *Genethliacon Lucani ad Pollam* = 135 verses). The longest poem of the third Book, III. 3 *Consolatio ad Claudium Etruscum*, with 216 verses, stands beside the shorter of the two poems which precede and follow it (III. 2 *Propempticon Maecio Celeri* = 143 verses, following III. 1 *Hercules Surrentinus Polli Felicis* = 186 verses; III. 4 *Capilli Flavi Earini* = 106 verses, preceding III. 5 *Ecloga ad Claudiam Uxorem* = 112 verses).

In Book IV, the first and last poems of the book stand beside poems which are longer than they (IV. 1 *Septimus Decimus Consulatus Imp. Aug. Germanici* = 47 verses, IV. 2 *Eucharisticon ad Imp. Germ. Domitianum* = 67 verses; IV. 8 *Gratulatio ad Iulium Menecraten* = 62 verses, IV. 9 *Hendecasyllabi Iocosi ad Plotium Grypum* = 55 verses). The longest poem of the book, IV. 3 *Via Domitiana*, containing 163 verses, stands at the end of the Domitianic series, forming, by its length as well as by its meter, a fitting conclusion to this group. The remaining four poems of the book alternate hexameters and lyric meters, both hexametric and lyric poems being of almost exactly equal length (IV. 4 *Epistula ad Vitorium Marcellum* = 105 hexameters; IV. 6 *Hercules Epitrapezios Novi Vindicis* = 109 hexameters; IV. 5 *Ode Lyrica ad Septimium Severum* = 60 Alcaics, IV. 7 *Ode Lyrica ad Vibium Maximum* = 56 Sapphics.)

Statius' evident interest in variation of length as a structural principle in the ordering of poetic books seems to have impressed the editor of Book V, who has organized the five poems of the book upon a principle of alternation of longer and shorter poems, the shortest and longest poems of the book being juxtaposed:

V. 1 *Epicedion in Priscillam <Abascanti> Uxorem* = 262 verses
V. 2 *Laudes Crispini Vetti Bolani* = 180 verses
V. 3 *Epicedion in Patrem Suum* = 293 verses
V. 4 *Somnus* = 19 verses
V. 5 *Epicedion in Puerum Suum* = 87 verses extant.

CHAPTER FOUR

STRUCTURAL PRINCIPLES OF INDIVIDUAL POEMS IN THE *SILVAE*

We have seen that the influence of rhetoric upon structuring in the *Silvae* has been exaggerated, and that the careful organization of his work was a major concern of Statius. We shall now attempt to determine upon what principles he has built the individual poems of the *Silvae*, focusing our attention upon Statius' use of thematic structuring, an aspect of the composition which has been hitherto virtually unexplored.

In his commentary on the *Silvae*, Friedrich Vollmer frequently praises Statius' art of smooth and careful composition. In the introduction to his commentary on *Silvae* II. 1 *Glaucias Atedi Melioris Delicatus*, for example, Vollmer speaks of the poet's mastery at combining well-worn elements to make up a new poetic whole, "So zeigt auch die Inhaltsangabe dieses ersten Trostgedichtes aus Statius' Sammlung, wie geschickt der Dichter, der sich darin bei weitem über den Verfasser der Cons. ad Liviam erhebt, die üblichen τόποι παραμυθητικοί zu einem glatt und schön gefügten Ganzen aufbaut, dessen einzelne Steine uns zwar wohlbekannt sind, aber doch durch ihre neue Form und ihre Ordnung die Hand eines geschickten Baumeisters verraten." [1] Yet, as Vollmer's use of the word *Inhaltsangabe*, or "table of contents," to characterize his analysis of the *epicedion* acknowledges, his examinations of the structures of the *Silvae* are limited to summaries of the poems' contents.

A work of considerably more significance to our understanding of Statius' compositional art is Hubert Cancik's *Untersuchungen zur lyrischen Kunst des P. Papinius Statius*.[2] Cancik deals exclusively with those *Silvae* which concern art, architecture, and the cult of the Emperor, a group of poems which he terms *Sachlyrik*, or poems about objects (statues, roads, temples, villas, etc.), because he believes that this group of poems has been undervalued and neglected. As a result, *Silvae* I. 2 and 4; II. 1, 4, 5, and 7; II. 1, 2, 3, and 5; IV. 1, 4, 5, 7, and 8; and V. 2, 3, and 5, a group which Cancik terms *persönliche Gedichte,*[3] do not fall under the scope of his investigation. Because "personal poems" predominate in Books III and IV, he does not attempt structural analyses of those books. Further, he makes only a slight attempt to analyze the structure of two of the poems of Book V and none to relate that book thematically or structurally to the other books of the *Silvae,* on the grounds that Book V was not edited by Statius and remained in an unfinished state at the time of the poet's death. Because he limits himself to a small group of the *Silvae* and leaves half the poems out of consideration altogether, Cancik's study affords little insight into the structural principles which underlie the *Silvae* in their entirety.

---

[1] Vollmer, *P. Papinii Statii Silvarum Libri*, 316-317.

[2] Hubert Cancik, *Untersuchungen zur lyrischen Kunst des P. Papinius Statius* (Spudasmata, 13), Hildesheim, 1965.

In this chapter, we shall analyze the structure of all the poems in the collection, which are grouped by genre for discussion. This procedure will most effectively allow the similarities to be determined in the poet's handling of poems of like genre, as well as the devices which he employs to achieve *variatio* among compositions in the same genre. At the same time, analysis of similarities in treatment between poems of widely differing genres will show that a number of structural techniques are common to all the poems in the *Silvae.* These principles which determine the manner in which Statius builds his poems and the structural units within them, highlights thematic material of particular importance to the meaning of the poems, and organizes ideas within poems, although characteristic of Statius' art and at the same time part of the common coin of ancient poetic technique, have been virtually unnoticed by critics of the *Silvae.* A number of these structural devices are employed throughout the collection, and may be listed here for convenience.

Examination of all poems in the *Silvae* reveals that Statius' structural vocabulary is limited, but manipulated with considerable skill and variety. The hallmark of organization in the collection is the ring-composition, recessed panel structure which we discussed in Chapter III. The majority of the poems in the *Silvae* exhibit chiastically arranged panels of related or contrasted thematic material which frame a central panel of particular thematic significance. Despite the prevalence of this manner of organizing ideas in the collection, Statius abandons it in those poems in which he wishes either to create an illusion of informality or to suggest a sharp dichotomy between two ideas. In the latter case, the recessed panel structure is replaced by an overall bipartite organization. Recessed panel structuring is employed not only in the organization of whole poems in the *Silvae*, but also in the composition of smaller structural units within the poems.

---

[3] *Ibid.,* 9.

Recessed panel structuring assures a degree of regularity and symmetry in the poem in which it appears. Yet alongside this striving after regularity and balance there is everywhere apparent in the *Silvae* a contrasting attraction toward asymmetry which manifests itself in Statius' conscious attempt to avoid exact equality in the length of the balancing sections, and produces a striking tension between the principles of balance and unevenness.

Statius' use of conflict between symmetry and asymmetry as a structural principle in the *Silvae* has never been noted by scholars. Its use in the *Thebaid* of Statius and in much of post-Augustan Roman literature has long been recognized and has generally been considered to be an aspect of Baroque, or Mannerist, craftsmanship.[4] The Baroque artist places himself in opposition to the regularity and restraint of Classical craftsmanship. Baroque subject matter, as well as form, differs from the Classical model, favoring on the one hand the painful and grotesque and on the other the pitiful and sentimental.[5] The *Silvae* are an example of the latter type. In both cases, the Baroque artist seeks to outdo the Classical by an exaggeration of those motifs and approaches which he has observed in Classical models. In the Classical, therefore, lie the seeds of the Baroque.

The use of recessed panel structure allows the poet to highlight material of particular importance to the theme of his composition by assigning it to the central panel. Quite often the central panel in the *Silvae* is occupied by an αἴτιον. Etiological accounts of the origins of customs, rites, names, and historical events had formed an important ingredient in poetic composition since Callimachus who, in his *Aetia*, devoted four books of elegiacs to etiological stories. Following Callimachus, Propertius, in Book IV. 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, and 10, attempted to compose a Roman *Aetia*, a task realized by Ovid's *Fasti*. Statius studied Callimachus in school (*Silvae* V. 3. 156-157) and, as his *epithalamium* (*Silvae* I. 2) makes clear, was familiar with the subject matter and techniques of Roman elegy, incorporating them into the *Silvae* when appropriate.[6] It was natural that Statius employ some etiological elements in his occasional poetry, but the extent to which he used αἴτια in the *Silvae* is remarkable. *Silvae* I. 2 *Epithalamium in Stellam et Violentillam* contains an αἴτιον (51-200) explaining how the marriage of Stella and Violentilla came about. *Silvae* II. 3 *Arbor Atedi Melioris* is entirely etiological, for it gives the cause of the curiously bent shape of the plane tree which overhung Melior's pool. An αἴτιον forms the central panel in *Silvae* III. 1 *Hercules Surrentinus Polli Felicis* (49-153), giving the reason why Hercules has a new temple on Melior's estate. Finally, *Silvae* III. 4 *Capilli Flavi Earini* also incorporates an αἴτιον as a central panel (21-77), to explain the origin of the connection of Earinus with the Roman imperial family.

---

[4] A number of valuable studies have been devoted to Mannerism in Roman literature. The most famous account of literary Mannerism is Ernst Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, transl. by Willard Trask (Bollingen Series, 36), New York, 1953, 272-310. A more recent work on Mannerism in Seneca, Lucan, and the Flavian epic poets is Erich Burck, *Vom römischen Manierismus* (Libelli, 327), Darmstadt, 1971. Studies in Statian Mannerism include Schetter, *Untersuchungen zur epischen Kunst des Statius, passim*; Friedrich, "Über die Silvae des Statius," *passim*; Cancik, *Untersuchungen*, 38-64; and Vessey, *Statius and the Thebaid*, 7-14.

[5] Burck, *Vom römischen Manierismus*, 17.

Statian αἴτια have several features in common. They are regularly highlighted by being assigned a position as a central panel in a ring-composition structure. Each example in the *Silvae* is composed wholly or in great part of a speech or speeches, in each case delivered by a divinity who explains the cause of the phenomenon under discussion. The device of having a deity speak in the αἴτιον serves to lend greater credence to the poet's account and pays a graceful compliment to the addressee by indicating the interest of heaven in his affairs. In this way the αἴτια reflect the encomiastic nature of the *Silvae*.

Statius achieves variety in his use of recessed panel structuring by employing a number of structural principles simultaneously in the organization of a poem. The circular movement of thought implicit in ring-composition, recessed panel structuring is on occasion supplemented in the *Silvae* by a linear progression of time representing, for example, the passage of time in a day or the advance from the present into the future.

---

[6] See Chapter II, 30-31.

Statius' characteristic manner of developing ideas within the structural units of the *Silvae*, which he shares in common with other post-Augustan writers, again assures variety in the use of recessed panel structuring. Statius, like Seneca, Lucan, and Tacitus, tends to construct the sections of his poems in such a way as to secure a gradual intensification of thought and emotion which reaches a climax at the end of the sections. This thought pattern is well characterized by the German term *Steigerung*,[7] and its use in the *Silvae* has been noted though imperfectly analyzed by Hubert Cancik. He observes that structural units in the *Silvae* frequently end with a striking or paradoxical formula, or *Pointe*, which may be expressed as a mythological allusion or a verse of praise directed toward the Emperor or the addressee of the poem. Often oxymora, ellipsis, or unusual word order marks such *Pointen*.[8] Cancik's concentration upon the use of the point as a conclusion-building element causes its function within the structural units to be somewhat overlooked, for he gives the impression that the point is tacked on merely to provide a striking close to these units and is thus a device essentially independent of and external to the sense of the passages which they close. Examination of all structural units within the *Silvae* which embody a point shows, however, that the point forms an integrated conclusion to a thought pattern which is fundamentally climactic. That such a manner of structuring ideas should predominate in the *Silvae* is perhaps natural in a collection the character of which consists mainly of praise and magnification.

Closely related to Statius' use of climactic thought progression is his tendency to develop his themes by gradually unfolding and expanding ideas hinted at earlier in a poem. This Statian technique has been noted by Vinzenz Buchheit in the case of the poet's gradual introduction of Polla Argentaria into *Silvae* II. 7 *Genethliacon Lucani*. Although Buchheit does not analyze the use of this device in any other poem of the *Silvae*, he recognizes that it is characteristic of Statius' technique in his occasional poetry,[9] but makes no attempt to speculate on the function of this unfolding device in the *Silvae.* It is not unlike that of the climactic thought progression discussed above. Gradual unfolding of a theme serves to magnify the subject under discussion by slowly introducing the reader to new and unexpected aspects of that subject.

---

[7] A good discussion of *Steigerungstechnik* in Lucan's *Bellum Civile* is provided by Werner Rutz, "Studien zur Kompositionskunst und zur epischen Technik Lucans" (Dissertation, Kiel, 1950), Chapter I: Die Komposition der Pharsalia, 3-60; reprinted in Werner Rutz, ed. *Lucan* (Wege der Forschung, 235), Darmstadt, 1970, 160-216, especially 162-168 and 207.

[8] Cancik, 23.

[9] Vinzenz Buchheit, "Statius' Geburtstagsgedicht zu Ehren Lucans

The following examination, according to genre, of the poems of the *Silvae* analyzes instances of these devices at work in a number of genres within the collection and isolates those principles which are unique to one genre in the *Silvae.*

A. *Consolationes*

The consolatory poems of Statius (*Silvae* II. 1, II. 4, II. 5, II. 6, III. 3, V. 1, V. 3, and V. 5) regularly consist of four primary structural divisions which Kenneth Latta Baucom, in his study of four of Statius' *consolationes,* has conveniently termed *exordium, laudatio, lamentatio,* and *solacia.*[10] Because Baucom's classifications are an accurate representation of the overall structure of the Statian *consolatio,* we shall adopt his terminology in our discussion of the consolatory poems.

Although critics dealing with ancient consolatory literature are agreed on the structural elements of the Statian *consolatio,* none has attempted to understand what thematic purpose is served by this structural pattern. Upon the physical structure of *exordium-laudatio-lamentatio-solacia,* Statius has superimposed a temporal structure which reflects a gradual movement from sadness in the present, through happiness and sadness in the past, to reconciliation and hope for the future. The *exordium* of the Statian *consolatio* is the most varied section of the poems, but an unvarying element is an account of the present state of unbounded grief experienced by the bereaved. In the *laudatio* which follows, the poet moves into the distant past to remind the addressee of the exceptional virtues of

---

(Silv. 2, 7)," *Hermes* 88 (1960), 240 note 5, "Es sei noch auf eine Form hingewiesen, die offenbar Prinzip der Kompositionskunst des Statius war, was im einzelnen noch zu prüfen wäre: Aussagen, die dem Dichter im Gedichtganzen wesentlich erscheinen, werden in mehreren Ansätzen bewältigt, und zwar so, dass das Thema jeweils erstmals leise anklingt, stärker wiederkehrt, um sich dann später voll zu entfalten."

[10] Baucom, "Four *Consolationes* of Statius," 23. I am adopting only Baucom's terms *exordium, laudatio, lamentatio, solacia.* The line numbers for the scope of these divisions within each Statian *consolatio* are based on my own analysis of the poems and do not necessarily agree with Baucom's divisions.

the deceased. The *lamentatio*, which recounts the death and funeral of the deceased, marks the climax of grief but simultaneously prepares the way for a return to the present by assuring the addressee that he has, by his scrupulous care for the funeral, his pious grief, and his bestowal of immortality upon the deceased through Statius' poetic memorial, paid all his debt to the deceased. The final *solacia* offer the addressee hope for the future by assuring him that the dead person is happy and would not want his family to mourn inordinately. The structure of the poem thus underlines the development of the thought.

Statius allows himself most freedom, both in theme and treatment, in the *exordia* to his *consolationes*. In the *exordium* of *Silvae* II. 6 *Consolatio ad Flavium Ursum de Amissione Pueri Delicati* (1-20), he emphasizes the fact that the favorite of Ursus was a slave, and argues that the loss of the slave is more bitter than would have been the loss of a family member. *Silvae* II. 1 *Glaucias Atedi Melioris Delicatus* also mourns the death of a slave, but Statius does not emphasize the fact of slavery in the *exordium* of II. 1 (1-35), dwelling instead upon the intensity of Melior's grief. In the *exordium* of *Silvae* III. 3, which mourns the death of the aged father of Claudius Etruscus, the emphasis is upon the son's *pietas*. Poetry as a lasting monument to the dead and the *pietas* which called forth Statius' song form the subject of the *exordium* of *Silvae* V. 1 (1-42). *Silvae* V. 3 and V. 5 treat respectively the death of Statius' father and of the poet's adopted son, and in the *exordia* of both poems Statius discusses his own grief and helplessness.

To give an example of Statius' skillful employment of several of the structural devices outlined earlier in this chapter, let us examine the touching *exordium* of *Silvae* II. 6. We may represent its organization schematically:

I. A. Who places distinctions and limits on grief? (1-2a)
    B. Smaller wounds can be more painful (2b-8a)
II. He was a very special slave (8b-17)
    A. You mourn a slave (8b-14)
        1. Fortune does not understand human feelings (8b-12a)
        2. He deserves your grief, so take your fill of mourning (12b-14a)
    B. But, you mourn a *human being* (14b-17a)
        His slavery was sweet (15-17a)
III. A. Who places limits on *this* grief? (17b-18a)
    B. Even the lowliest creatures have been mourned (18b-20).

The progress of thought in the paragraph is a remarkable instance of Statius' ability to turn unpromising subject matter to best advantage. The poet begins with the fact that the dead boy Philetus was a slave, and ends by showing the child's true nobility. The first eight verses form a unit making a single point hinted at in verse 1 and fully developed in 8. Statius begins by stating that he who establishes gradations of grief is cruel (1-2a):

> Saeve nimis, lacrimis quisquis discrimina ponis
> lugendique modos!

He admits that the loss of one's child, wife, sister, or brother is a harsh blow (2b-6a):

> miserum est primaeva parenti
> pignora surgentisque (nefas!) accendere natos;
> durum et deserti praerepta coniuge partem
> conclamare tori, maesta et lamenta sororum
> et fratrum gemitus.

But a lesser blow may cause even greater pain (6b-8a):

> alter tamen et procul intrat
> alterius sensus, maioraque vulnera vincit
> plaga minor.

The thought reaches its climax in this paradoxical pronouncement. The outcry against *discrimina / lugendique modos* is answered by the poet's argument that a lesser blow may prove a greater source of suffering.

Verses 1-8a prepare the way for the revelation of 8b-17a: it is a slave who is mourned. Yet Philetus was a slave who deserved to be mourned. This important idea, central to the argument of the *exordium*, occupies its exact center (10-12a):

> sed famulum gemis, Vrse, pium, sed amore fideque
> has meritum lacrimas, cui maior stemmate iuncto
> libertas ex mente fuit.

The *exordium* ends with a repetition, in somewhat altered form, of the idea presented in 1-2a. Between 2 and 17, Statius has established the very special qualities of the *puer*, which allows him here to effect a carefully prepared transition from "Who places a limit on grief" to "Who places a limit on *this* grief" (*quisnam haec in funera missos / castiget luctus?*, (17-18).

In the central panel (8b-17), highlighted by this middle position because of the importance of its subject matter to the argument of the *exordium*, the poet's description of Ursus' grief is gradually unfolded and expanded: the child mourned was a slave, but a very special slave, and a human being. The panels which frame 8b-17a both treat the need to mourn, but by the time the poet has reached the last section of the *exordium* (17b-20), the death of a lowly slave has been rendered significant and deserving of lamentation. The progression of thought in the paragraph is thus climactic. Worthy of note is also the fact that the balancing members which make up the perfectly symmetrical structure of the paragraph are of slightly unequal length. The opening panel (1-2a; 1 1/2 verses) balances a closing panel of greater compass (18b-20; 2 1/2 verses). Likewise the first half of the central panel (8b-14a; 7 verses) is somewhat longer than the second half which balances it (14b-17a; 3 verses).

The *exordium* of the Statian *consolatio* is regularly limited in scope, since the poet uses it primarily to introduce the bereaved addressee and to state his reasons for offering consolation. The *laudatio*, in contrast, often constitutes the bulk of the poem,[11] which is a reflection of the nature of the *Silvae* as encomiastic poetry. The format of the Statian *laudatio* is unvarying. The beauty, both of person and of character, the ancestry, and the accomplishments of the deceased are praised in turn. In composing a *laudatio* of a slave child whose real attainments were slight and whose ancestry was scarcely a cause for praise, Statius faced a difficult problem. In such cases, he plays down the fact of ignoble birth either by omitting mention of the fact altogether in the *laudatio* or by arguing that the accidents of birth are inconsequential and can be overcome. The dead Claudius who forms the subject of *Silvae* III. 3 had been born a slave (43-44):

---

[11] The *laudatio* forms 43% of *Silvae* II. 1 *Glaucias Atedi Melioris Delicatus* (verses 36-136, or 101 verses out of 234). In II. 6 *Consolatio ad Flavium Ursum de Amissione Pueri Delicati*, the *laudatio* (verses 21-57) constitutes 35% of the 105-line poem. In III. 3 *Consolatio ad Claudium Etruscum*, the *laudatio* forms 59% of the poem (verses 43-171, or 129 verses out of 216). The praises of Priscilla tend to be diffused evenly throughout V. 1 *Epicedion in Priscillam <Abascanti> Uxorem*, which accounts for the relatively low 38% occupied by the formal *laudatio* in that poem (verses 43-134, or 98 verses out of 262). In *Silvae* V. 3 *Epicedion in Patrem Suum*, verses 80-252a, or 60% of the 293-verse poem, are devoted to praises of the poet's father. The *laudatio* of V. 5 *Epicedion in Puerum Suum* breaks off in the manuscripts after only 22 verses (66-87). The 65-line *exordium* of V. 5 is second in length only to that of V. 3, which suggests that V. 5 was accorded as expansive a treatment as was V. 3. If this was so, the *laudatio* in V. 5 may well have extended to 150 verses.

Non tibi clara quidem, senior placidissime, gentis
linea,

but the fact is no shame to Claudius, for his masters were the lords of East and West (46-47):

nec enim dominos de plebe tulisti,
sed quibus occasus pariter famulantur et ortus.

The *laudatio* of *Silvae* V. 1 *Epicedion in Priscillam <Abascanti> Uxorem* is interesting because it introduces two of the themes most frequently encountered in the *Silvae*: the importance of familial devotion and the position of the Emperor as guarantor of the peace and harmony of his people. Statius quickly passes over Priscilla's outward beauty to concentrate on the beauty of her soul. Women who are without such spiritual beauty are frequently praised for family ties and physical beauty (V. 1. 51-53a):

laudantur proavis aut pulchrae munere formae,
quae morum caruere bonis, falsoque potentes
laudis egent verae.

Priscilla is not without family connections and physical beauty, but her relationship with her husband is the glory of her life (53b-56):

tibi quamquam et origo niteret
et felix species multumque optanda maritis,
ex te maior honos, unum novisse cubile,
unum secretis agitare sub ossibus ignem.

The *laudatio* is a celebration of her devotion to Abascantus. She would gladly have undergone the dangers of war for her husband's sake, but she found a better way to win heaven's favor for him (71-74):

sed meliore via dextros tua vota marito
promeruere deos, dum nocte dieque fatigas
numina, dum cunctis supplex advolveris aris
et mitem genium domini praesentis adoras.

Priscilla's loyalty is directly responsible for her husband's advancement. Domitian readily grants the faithful wife's prayers, for he is eager to reward the *pietas* which he has already observed in Abascantus (75-80):

Audita es, venitque gradu Fortuna benigno.
vidit quippe pii iuvenis navamque quietem
intactamque fidem succinctaque pectora curis
et vigiles sensus et digna evolvere tantas
sobria corda vices, vidit, qui cuncta suorum
novit et inspectis ambit latus omne ministris.

In verses 75-80, the Statian themes of the Emperor as guarantor of harmony and familial love are directly linked. Domitian, as *censor morum*, keeps a vigilant eye upon his people and rewards acts of loyalty like those of Priscilla.

The subject matter and handling of the Statian *lamentatio* exhibit considerably less variation than does either the *exordium* or *laudatio*. As in the case of the *laudatio*, the format of the *lamentatio* is rigidly fixed. Statius begins each *lamentatio* with a shocked outcry against the cruelty of the gods who occasioned the death in question.[12] No outburst against the gods is made in III. 3 *Consolatio ad Claudium Etruscum* or V. 3 *Epicedion in Patrem Suum* because the men lamented in them were aged and their deaths not unexpected. The second section of the *lamentatio* is regularly an account of the illness and death of the individual lamented.[13] Elaborate descriptions of the funeral trappings and attendant sorrow form the third and final section of the *lamentatio*.[14]

Statius' account of the death of the slave boy Glaucias in the middle section of the *lamentatio* of *Silvae* II. 1 (146-157a) offers a striking example of Statius' ability to use structure to reinforce sense:

146-147	Glaucias in the grip of death
148	the cruel action of Fate
149-152	Glaucias and Melior united in Glaucias' last moments
153	calmness and consolation of Glaucias
154-157a	his beauty in death

The poet's account begins with Glaucias in the grip of death, his hair grasped by Proserpina (146-147):

> septima lux, et iam frigentia lumina torpent,
> iam complexa manu crinem tenet infera Iuno.

The cruel Fates hasten his death (148):

> Parcis fragilis urgentibus annos.

The main focus of the poet's attention is a recollection of the dying child's last moments (149-152). This longer panel is marked off syntactically from the remainder of the paragraph by being cast in the form of an address to Melior in the second person:

---

[12] *Silvae* II. 1. 137-145; II. 6. 58-68a; V. 1. 135-169.

[13] *Silvae* II. 1. 146-157a; II. 6. 68b-81; III. 3. 172-173a; V. 1. 170-208a; V. 3. 252b-260.

[14] *Silvae* II. 1. 157b-182; II. 6. 82-93a; III. 3. 173b-204; V. 1. 208b-246; V. 3. 261-276.

te vultu moriente videt linguaque cadente
murmurat; in te omnis vacui iam pectoris efflat
reliquias, solum meminit solumque vocantem
exaudit, tibique ora movet, tibi verba relinquit.

The repetition of pronouns in the second person (*te*, 149 . . . *te*, 150 . . . *tibi* . . . *tibi*, 152) stresses the touching fact that at the moment of his death all Glaucias' thoughts are of his beloved Melior. The central position which verses 149-152 occupy in the account of the boy's death highlights the union of these two souls.

The final lines of Statius' account of Glaucias' death stand in complete contrast to the opening lines of the section. Unlike these earlier verses which are full of horror (*frigentia lumina torpent*, 146; *Parcis urgentibus*, 148), verses 153-157a are infused with calmness and consolation. Glaucias himself consoles Melior (153):

prohibet gemitus consolaturque dolentem.

The poet can thank Fate that, despite the ravages of death outlined in verses 146-147a, the child dies with his beauty intact (154-157a):

gratum est, Fata, tamen quod non mors lenta iacentis
exedit puerile decus, manisque subivit
integer et nullo temeratus corpora damno,
qualis erat.

The third and final section of the Statian *lamentatio*, the description of the funeral trappings and grief, exhibits slight variation from poem to poem. In this section, Statius is eager to assure the bereaved that he has fully paid his debt to his loved one. Thus the poet can assure Flavius Ursus that he has paid his debt to Philetus (*Silvae* II. 6. 97-98a):

eximius licet ille animi meritusque doleri:
solvisti.

Statius seeks in his account of the funeral not so much variety as a general impression of luxury and elaborateness. The descriptions of the rare spices and herbs burned upon the pyre differ little from poem to poem.[15] In *Silvae* V. 1 *Epicedion in Priscillam <Abascanti> Uxorem*, Statius describes the actual tomb of the deceased, for its magnificence is a proof of Abascantus' *pietas* toward Priscilla and an indication that Abascantus has fulfilled his debt to his wife in a manner befitting a minister of Domitian (237b-241):

---

[15] The *Palaestini liquores* catalogued in II. 1. 161 appear as *templis / tura Palaestinis, simul Hebraeique liquores* in V. 1. 212-213, and the *munera graminis Indi* of II. 1. 160 become the *Indorum seges* of V. 1. 212. The *Cilicum flores* mentioned in II. 1. 160 reappear as the *Cilicum messis* in II. 6. 87.

> domus ista, domus! quis triste sepulcrum
> dixerit? hac merito visa pietate mariti
> protinus exclames: 'est hic, agnosco, minister
> illius, aeternae modo qui sacraria genti
> condidit inque alio posuit sua sidera caelo.'

The gift of Statius' poetry is a final sign that the bereaved has paid his debt to the deceased. It forms a sort of sepulchre in which the dead can rest for eternity. Claudius Etruscus has won the gift of Statius' song for his father by his exemplary piety toward the old man (*Silvae* III. 3. 215-216):

> nostra quoque exemplo meritus tibi carmina sancit
> hoc etiam gaudens cinerem donasse sepulcro.

The formal τόποι of consolation which constitute the final division of the Statian *consolatio* form a comparatively unimportant part of the composition. Every section of the Statian funeral lament is intended to console the bereaved and to alleviate his sorrow, a fact which renders formal *solacia* of slight importance. The *exordium* frequently voices the thought that the deceased has been fittingly remembered in verse, while the poet's account of the uncontrollable weeping of the survivor which occurs in this opening section of the *consolatio* serves also to comfort the addressee of the lament by its flattering portrayal of his pious sorrow. The extended *laudatio* reconciles the survivor to the fact of death by assuring him that the virtues of his loved one have not gone unnoticed. The *lamentatio* assures the survivor that he has accorded his loved one a proper funeral. The varied types of consolation expressed in the first three divisions of the Statian *consolatio* thus account for the fact that the formal commonplaces of solace voiced in the final division of the *consolatio* are few in number and tend to recur in the same order: the terrors of Hades do not alarm the deceased;[16] he is reunited with the shades of the virtuous;[17] he is happy in the Underworld.[18] It is clear that Statius concentrates upon those *solacia* which portray the happiness of the deceased in Hades, and tends to deemphasize the cruel finality of death. He seeks in his *solacia* to enable the bereaved to face the future and therefore expounds only those consolations which can most gently set the mourner's mind at ease.

---

[16] *Silvae* II. 1. 183-188; V. 1. 247-252; V. 3. 277-283.

[17] *Silvae* II. 1. 189-207; II. 6. 98-102; III. 3. 205-207; V. 1. 253-257; V. 3. 284-287.

[18] *Silvae* II. 1. 227-234; III. 3. 208-214; V. 1. 258-262; V. 3. 288-293.

Among the most charming poems in the *Silvae* are Statius' two miniature *epicedia* lamenting the deaths of animals, *Silvae* II. 4 *Psittacus Eiusdem* and II. 5 *Leo Mansuetus.* The treatment which scholars have accorded these compositions, however, has been unsatisfactory and at times erroneous.[19] The difficulties in interpretation which these poems have caused critics disappear when we see that both poems exactly reproduce the format typical of the Statian *consolatio*: *exordium-laudatio-lamentatio-solacia.* The significant difference between the poems is one of tone. *Silvae* II. 4 mourns the passing of the pet parrot of Atedius Melior, and its tone is light, at times even humorous, in marked contrast to II. 5 which mourns the death, in the arena and before the Emperor's eyes, of a tamed lion. A lament on the heroic death of the lion in the presence of Domitian demanded a more serious treatment than a commemoration of the domestic tragedy of the parrot's passing.[20]

---

[19] Vollmer, *P. Papinii Statii Silvarum Libri,* 360, recognizes that *Silvae* II. 4 is in format a *consolatio* "Unverkennbar parodiert Statius, doch mit einem gewissen Ernste, die Form seiner eigenen Epikedien. . . ." He offers no structural analysis of II. 4, however, and takes no note of the fact that *Silvae* II. 5 follows the format characteristic of the Statian *consolatio.* Sister Mary Edmond Fern, *The Latin Consolatio,* 167, has also classed II. 4 as an *epicedion,* but her discussion of the poem is limited to a summary of the contents of the poem, and she does not treat II. 5 at all. In his discussion of II. 4, Gerhard Herrlinger, *Totenklage um Tiere,* 88, betrays a fundamental misunderstanding of the structure of the Statian *consolatio.* He sees in the poet's funeral laments, including II. 4, a ". . . stets schablonenhafte Gliederung in lamentatio, laudatio und consolatio." Herrlinger's division of the *consolatio* is jumbled since, as we saw in the case of each of the *consolationes* which mourn the death of humans, the *laudatio* precedes the *lamentatio,* as it does, indeed, in the two laments on the death of animals. He does not discuss II. 5 in any detail. Hubert Cancik, "Amphitheater. Zum Problem der 'Gesamtinterpretation' am Beispiel von Statius, Silve II. 5: Leo mansuetus," *AU* 14, 3 (1971), 66-81, has analyzed II. 5, but recognizes elements of the *consolatio* only in the final verses of the poem, 77-78, "Der Schlussteil enthält *solacia* (V. 24); damit ist das Gedicht ausdrücklich in der Klasse der Tierepikedien eingeordnet." He has not observed the presence in II. 5 of a distinct *laudatio* and *lamentatio.*

[20] Herrlinger, *Totenklage um Tiere,* 87, has well expressed the difference between the two poems, "Der stilistische Unterschied ist aber namentlich durch die Personen bedingt, denen die Gedichte gewidmet sind. Bei Melior, dem vertrauten Freund und Gönner des Dichters, war eine parodische Behandlung des Stoffes sehr wohl am Platz. Bei dem Kaiser Domitian war dies völlig unmöglich. Wenn Statius einen Vorfall, der zum Herrscher

The first ten verses of *Silvae* II. 4 comprise the *exordium*:

I. The parrot is dead (1-3)
II. Flashback into yesterday (4-8a):
    The parrot's character
III. The parrot is dead (*at nunc*, 8) (8b-10).

The *exordium* details the grief felt by the parrot's human survivors and explains Statius' suitability for offering consolation. Shock and disbelief fill the survivors (1-3):

Psittace dux volucrum, domini facunda voluptas,
humanae sollers imitator psittace linguae,
quis tua tam subito praeclusit murmura fato?

In keeping with a practice common in the *Silvae*, a theme to be expanded later in the poem is introduced in these opening verses. The parrot's ability to speak is touched upon briefly in *humanas sollers imitator linguae* (2), to be fully discussed in 7-10.

The subject of the bird's death reappears at the end of the *exordium* (8b-10). These verses are connected to 1-3 both in their time sequence, since they deal with the present (*at nunc*, 8), in contrast to 4-8a which form a flashback to better times, and in their syntax, since 8b-10, like 1-3, comprise a direct address to the parrot (*ille canorus habes*, 9). Statius uses a mythic point to mark the end of the *exordium*. The parrot spoke so soon before his passing that he seemed like a swan uttering the song that betokens his death (8b-10):

at nunc aeterna silentia Lethes
ille canorus habes. cedat Phaethontia vulgi
fabula: non soli celebrant sua funera cycni.

The end panels of the *exordium* enfold a nostalgic account of happier days in Melior's house (4-8a). Here Statius briefly establishes his own connection to the parrot and thus his right to offer consolation. The theme of the bird's ability to speak, alluded to in 1-2, is also expanded by the addition of the fact that the parrot could repeat greetings and memorized words:

hesternas, miserande, dapes moriturus inisti
nobiscum, et gratae carpentem munera mensae
errantemque toris mediae plus tempore noctis
vidimus. affatus etiam meditataque verba
reddideras.

---

irgendwelchen Bezug hatte, dichterisch fassen wollte, so sah er sich ganz von selbst dazu gezwungen, ihm durch ernste Darstellung eine erhöhte Bedeutung zu verleihen."

In *Silvae* II. 5, the *laudatio* subsumes the function of the *exordium*, thereby allowing the extended *lamentatio* (7-23) to form the bulk of the composition. The death itself and the grief which it caused the other lions form the substance of the *lamentatio*, placing the treatment of the section in the tradition of the Statian *lamentatio*. We do not learn the exact circumstances of the lion's death, only that he was overtaken by a beast that was fleeing from him (*victus fugiente fera*, 11). In common with other Statian consolations, the behavior of the dying subject is detailed. Even at death the lion's spirit remained (17b-19a):

mansere animi, virtusque cadenti
a media iam morte redit, nec protinus omnes
terga dedere minae.

Statius' handling of the *solacia* differs widely in the two poems. The consolations uttered in the final division of II. 4 (29-37) directly echo the poet's formal laments on the deaths of human beings. As in the formal *consolationes*, Statius is concerned with assuring Melior that he has done his duty to the deceased. The same costly herbs familiar from other Statian consolations rendered the parrot's funeral magnificent (33b-36a):

at non inglorius umbris
mittitur: Assyrio cineres adolentur amomo
et tenues Arabum respirant gramine plumae
Sicaniisque crocis.

Melior can take consolation in the fact that the parrot escaped the ravages of old age (36b-37):

senio nec fessus inerti
scandet odoratos phoenix felicior ignis.

The final division of *Silvae* II. 5 is somewhat unusual in that the consolation is directed to the deceased rather than to a survivor. This change allows Statius to render a compliment to Domitian. The lion can take with him the consolation that the people and Senate sighed for him, but even more, he can rest in the knowledge that the Emperor himself wept at his death. The poem thus ends with a flattering representation of the greatheartedness of Domitian who could shed a tear for the death of a single animal (27b-30):

magni quod Caesaris ora
inter tot Scythicas Libycasque, a litore Rheni
et Pharia de gente feras, quas perdere vile est,
unius amissi tetigit iactura leonis.

B. *Genethliaca*

Silvae II. 7 *Genethliacon Lucani* fuses elements of a consolatory poem and a birthday ode. The fact that Statius has himself named the poem a *genethliacon* (Praef. II. 24) has led scholars to concentrate upon those aspects of it which mark it as a birthday poem,[21] although the structural divisions of the *genethliacon* closely parallel the sequence of *exordium-laudatio-lamentatio-solacia* which we noted in the formal *consolationes*. Only Friedrich Vollmer seems to have noted the consolatory elements of the poem,[22] but he has not developed his observation further. In his fine study of *Silvae* II. 7, Vinzenz Buchheit has outlined the overall structure of the poem, which he feels to be organized primarily upon a temporal principle. According to his analysis, verses 1-35 and 107-135 deal with experiences taking place at the birthday celebration in the present time, while verses 36-104, comprising a speech by the Muse Calliope, begin in the past and move slowly to the present.[23] Buchheit does not observe that the temporal divisions of the poem correspond with the consolatory divisions of the poem. Verses 1-35 form the *exordium*; Calliope's speech constitutes the *laudatio* and *lamentatio*; verses 107-135 contain the commonplaces of consolation. We may thus represent the simultaneous temporal, consolatory, and formal structures of the poem as in the Chart on the next page.

The structure of the opening section of the introduction (1-23) is characteristic of Statius' manner of organizing paragraphs in the *Silvae*:

I. *Lucani proprium diem*—Statement of theme of the poem (1-4)
II. Invocation, intended to glorify Lucan (5-18)
    A. Invocation proper (5-8)
    B. Instructions to gods in preparation for the celebration (9-18)
III. *Lucan* is our subject—Expanded version of 1-4 (19-23).

The first twenty-three verses form an extended invocation of all Muses of song and poetry inviting them to flock to Lucan's birthday celebration. The unusual length of the invocation suggests that Statius felt that he was dealing with a very great figure and needed

---

[21] This is the emphasis of Vinzenz Buchheit, "Statius' Geburtstagsgedicht zu Ehren Lucans." His article contains a lengthy discussion(241-245) of the position of Statius' *genethliacon* in the tradition of the birthday poem.

[22] Vollmer, *P. Papinii Statii Silvarum Libri*, 373, "Statius' Gedicht steht dem Inhalte nach dem λόγος ἐπιτάφιος näher; die Rede der Kalliope ist eine völlige laudatio funebris."

[23] Buchheit, 233.

TEMPORAL:	*CONSOLATORY*:	*FORMAL*:
I. Present	I. *Exordium*	I. Introduction (1-35) A. Lucan is our subject B. Happy Baetica!
II. Past with movement into present	II. A-B 2 *Laudatio*	II. Muse's prophecy (36-106) A. Introduction: Muse lays aside mourning B. Prophecy in direct speech 1. Lucan's writings 2. Lucan's marriage
	B 3-C *Lamentatio*	3. Lucan's death C. Conclusion: Muse takes up mourning
III. Present and future	III. *Solacia*	III. Consolation to Polla (107-135)

all the divine help which he could muster. Every heaven-inspired bard is invited to mark the day (1-4):

> Lucani proprium diem frequentet
> quisquis collibus Isthmiae Diones
> docto pectora concitatus oestro
> pendentis bibit ungulae liquorem.

In the long central panel which follows (5-18), Statius expands the general invocation uttered in verses 2-4 by naming specific deities who are to take part in the celebration and assigning them tasks in the festivities. Mercury, Bacchus, Apollo, and the Muses are summoned and instructed to deck themselves with fresh fillets and to set the learned streams of verse flowing more freely. Verses 1-18 prepare for the climax reached in 19-23. In these final lines of the first section of the introduction, the language becomes sacral as Lucan, portrayed up till now as the *poeta doctus*, takes on the character of high priest of Roman poets. Verses 19-23 substantially repeat the message of 1-4, that Lucan is the poet's subject, but Statius now introduces a new aspect of the theme: the religious awe called forth by the greatness of the dead poet (19-23):

> Lucanum canimus, favete linguis,
> vestra est ista dies, favete, Musae,
> dum qui vos geminas tulit per artes,
> et vinctae pede vocis et solutae,
> Romani colitur chori sacerdos.

The religious formula *favete linguis* (19) and the verb *colitur* (23) are graphic illustrations of the *reverentia* for Lucan which Statius had professed in the prose preface to *Silvae* II (Praef. II. 26-27).

Calliope's account of Lucan's literary career (41-80), which forms the first section of the *laudatio*, is structured in a manner similar to the organization of the first half of the introduction, but the symmetry of the Muses' catalogue is even more striking:

4 verses	I. You will excel the poets of old and their subjects (41-44)
9 verses	II. *Bellum Civile* (45-53)
10 verses	III. Early Works (54-63)
9 verses	IV. *Bellum Civile* (64-72)
8 verses	V. You will excel the poets of old and their subjects (73-80).

Calliope begins her account of Lucan's literary career with a general statement that his work will outshine the works of earlier poets, and have an effect far greater than the poetry of Orpheus (41b-44):

puer o dicate Musis,
longaevos cito transiture vatis,
non tu flumina nec greges ferarum
nec plectro Geticas movebis ornos.

Lucan's verse will excel other poets because he will sing a Roman song that will move all classes of Rome's population by its eloquence (45-47). Others may tread well-worn paths (*trita vatibus orbita*, 51), but Lucan will celebrate his own nation (52-53):

tu carus Latio memorque gentis
carmen fortior exseris togatum.

This second section of the Muse's catalogue embodies Statius' first allusion to the *Bellum Civile*, which he treats in an expanded and developed form in 64-72. That others have dealt with well-worn subjects which the present writer seeks to avoid is of course a commonplace in Roman poetry.[24] Statius intends here to emphasize Lucan's originality in dealing with recent history in an unusual manner (without the intervention of the gods), which accounts for his opposition of Lucan's manner with the tired mythological tales of Troy, Odysseus, and the Argonauts mentioned in verses 48-50.

Verses 54-63 treat of Lucan's earlier writings. *Ac primum* (54), which marks a movement back to the beginning of Lucan's career, effects a transition from the discussion of the *Bellum Civile.* This section forms the central panel in the Muse's discussion of Lucan's works, and, as is generally true of the central panel in poetic structures in the *Silvae,* it is the longest part of the division (41-80). Unusual, however, is the fact that the central panel treats what one might well consider to be the least important phase of Lucan's career, the early works, whose relative insignificance Statius underlines by his characterization of the poems as apprentice works (*ludes,* 55). It is generally Statius' practice to highlight the most important element in his discussion by assigning it to a central position in his poetic structures.

---

[24] See, for example, Lucretius I. 926-950 and IV. 1-25; Vergil's *Georgics* III. 3-15 and 291-293; Manilius I. 3-6, II. 1-49, and III. 1-42; *Aetna* 8-28; Nemesianus' *Cynegetica* 15-44.

Statius carefully marks progression of time once again as he turns back to the *Bellum Civile* in 64-72. This he calls the product of Lucan's maturing manhood (*coepta generosior iuventa,* 64). Statius' discussion of the *Bellum Civile* consists of a précis of the action of the epic reminiscent of Lucan's own descriptions. Statius' characterization of Pompey as *gratum popularitate Magnum* (69) clearly recalls Lucan's delineation of the general (*Bellum Civile* I. 132-133) as a man swayed by the breezes of popularity, *totus popularibus auris / impelli,* while his reference to the murder of Pompey as the *Pelusiaci scelus Canopi* (70) is reminiscent of Lucan's indignant cry to the gods after his account of Pompey's death (*Bellum Civile* VIII. 542-544):

> o superi, Nilusne et barbara Memphis
> et Pelusiaci tam mollis turba Canopi
> hos animos?

The final verses of the Muse's account of Lucan's works (73-80) is an expanded version of her earlier claim that Lucan's poetry will excel the poets of old. Statius becomes more specific and lists Ennius, Lucretius, Varro of Atax, and Ovid as poets whose works will be thrown into the shade by Lucan (75-78):

> cedet Musa rudis ferocis Enni
> et docti furor arduus Lucreti,
> et qui per freta duxit Argonautas,
> et qui corpora prima transfigurat.

The section ends upon a hyperbolic climax as Statius asserts that even the *Aeneid* will pay homage to Lucan (79b-80):

> ipsa te Latinis
> Aeneis venerabitur canentem.

The movement of thought in the Muse's catalogue is from the general to the specific, from hints to expansion by means of gradual unfolding of the poet's meaning. This technique of expansion accounts for the length of the final section of the catalogue (73-80), for it develops, by specific examples, the subject matter of the briefer opening section (41-44).

The poet's treatment of Lucan's widow Polla Argentaria provides a striking example of Statius' technique of gradually introducing thematic material. Polla had commissioned the *genethliacon* (Praef. II. 24-26), and it was only natural that she should figure prominently in it. We meet her first in verses 62-63, in the catalogue of Lucan's minor works, as the subject of a *dulcis adlocutio* commemorating her chaste character. In the second section of the Muse's prophecy (81-88), Polla appears again as Statius develops the subject of her chastity in a discussion of her marriage to Lucan. Her third appearance (120-131) emphasizes at length her faithful reverence for her dead husband. Lucan derives no less comfort from the loyalty of Polla than she from his happiness in death, for she enjoys a spiritual union with the poet which is greater than the empty solace afforded by graven images (124-131a):

haec te non thiasis procax dolosis
falsi numinis induit figura,
ipsum sed colit et frequentat ipsum
imis altius insitum medullis;
at solacia vana subministrat
vultus, qui simili notatus auro
stratis praenitet incubatque somno
securae.

Here, near the end of the *genethliacon*, the religious aura which surrounds the memory of Lucan reemerges from the introduction to the poem in a repetition of verbs bearing religious connotations (*frequentet*, 1: *frequentat*, 126; *colitur*, 23: *colit*, 126). At the same time, the final verses of the poem reintroduce the festive character of the opening lines of the poem (1-18), which had imparted to these early verses the joyous tone typical in the *genethliacon*. The bulk of the composition displays a somber manner more suited to a funeral lament than to a birthday poem, but now, in the closing lines of the poem, Statius bids death and sadness to withdraw and tears of happiness to replace them (131b-135):

procul hinc abite, Mortes:
haec vitae genialis est origo.

> cedat luctus atrox genisque manent
> iam dulces lacrimae, dolorque festus
> quicquid fleverat ante, nunc adoret.

The return in the closing verses of the poem of the tone of celebration seen in the introduction thus serves to draw together the elements of the *genethliacon* and the *consolatio* which blend in *Silvae* II. 7, and to provide the poem with a perfect ring-composition structure uniting thematic material from all parts of the composition.

The remaining birthday poems in the collection, *Silvae* IV. 7 *Ode Lyrica ad Vibium Maximum* and IV. 8 *Gratulatio ad Iulium Menecraten*, exhibit interesting structural innovations. Recessed panel structure appears in neither the overall structure nor in the organization of smaller units in *Silvae* IV. 7, and only in a highly altered form in IV. 8. *Silvae* IV. 7 is bipartite in structure:

I. Statius (1-28)
  A. Introduction: Call for inspiration for a new endeavor (1-12)
    1. Put aside epic, Erato, and inspire a slighter composition (1-4)
    2. Allow me to do something new, Pindar (5-8)
    3. I am refining my poetry for Maximus (9-12)
  B. The poet's activities (13-28)
    1. When will you be back, Maximus? (13-16)
    2. I am in Rome (17-20)
    3. My *Achilleid* makes no progress without you (21-24)
    4. But my *Thebaid* had your guidance (25-28)
II. Maximus (*genethliacon*) (29-56)
  A. Birth of a son (29-32)
  B. Childlessness must be avoided (33-40)
    1. The heir waits for his relative's death (33-36)
    2. He resents the funeral expenses (37-40)
  C. May the child live long and learn his father's and grandfather's skills (41-44)
    1. Maximus as military man (45-48)
    2. Grandfather as military man (49-52)
    3. Maximus as man of letters (53-56).

Statius' ode furnishes an example of his tendency to abandon recessed panel structure in a composition built upon a principle of opposition of two thematic elements. *Silvae* IV. 7 is built upon a contrast between the interests and aspirations of Statius, a topic which comprises verses 1-28, and the current activities of Maximus, discussion of which occupies verses 29-56. Each of the friends is accorded exactly one half of the composition.

Silvae IV. 7 is Statius' only poem in Sapphics and, as the poet must have been aware, the first Latin *genethliacon* in this meter. These circumstances have occasioned the extended introduction to the poem (1-12) which provides us with some insight into Statius' views of the poet's craft. In the opening stanza, Statius temporarily puts aside the old, represented by his epic labors and takes up a new, slighter form of composition (1-4):

Iam diu lato satiata campo
fortis heroos, Erato, labores
differ atque ingens opus in minores
contrahe gyros.

In the *Silvae,* poetry is regularly seen as a labor, difficult but rewarding, a *dulce periculum* (*Silvae* IV. 5. 25), the successful pursuit of which requires the advice and active involvement of one's friends. The poet, in turn, benefits his friends through his verse. The comfort brought to the bereaved and the gift of immortality to the deceased bestowed by his funeral laments provide an example of this social function of poetry. The composition of epic always appears in the *Silvae* as a heavy task requiring occasional respite. In *Silvae* I. 5. 8-9, Statius begs Thebes to grant him some time for diversion with his friend Claudius Etruscus:

paulum arma nocentia, Thebae,
ponite: dilecto volo lascivire sodali.

Again in IV. 6 *Hercules Epitrapezios Novi Vindicis,* Statius describes himself relaxing from his epic endeavors, *remittentem curas Phoeboque levatum / pectora* (1-2). In IV. 7, he seeks a rest from the mighty task (*ingens opus*) of epic while he tries a poem in a medium slighter than is his wont.

The type of poem which Statius is attempting is not only slighter, but finer as well, as is made clear by the poet's choice of words in the third stanza (9-12):

Maximo carmen tenuare tempto;
nunc ab intonsa capienda myrto
serta, nunc maior sitis et bibendus
castior amnis.

Statius' use of the verb *tenuare,* "to rarefy," may provide us with a clue that the *Silvae* were written with more care than the poet is willing to admit. Friedrich Vollmer believes that Statius combines the ideas of smallness of size and carefulness of workmanship in his use of the term *tenuare*, "Der Ausdruck *tenuare*, durch *minores gyros* hervorgerufen, ist nach zwei Seiten zu verstehen: ein lyrisches Gedicht ist zwar kleiner als der *latus campus* des Epos, will aber feiner ausgearbeitet sein. Das Bild vom Spinnen deutet ein, dass es die Hauptkunst ist, einen feinen und doch festen Faden zu ziehen (Hor. Ep. II. 1. 225 *tenui deducta poemata filo* . . . .)".[25] Statius seems to say that he is making a conscious effort to refine his manner of composition in this ode, which is why he needs the aid of Pindar, the *regnator lyricae cohortis* (5).

In *Silvae* IV. 8, we do not find the exact numerical symmetry of the parts which we observed in the halves of IV. 7, but note instead an example of the tension between the attraction toward symmetry and the movement toward asymmetry which we discussed as a characteristic of Baroque craftsmanship. The overall structure of the poem is symmetrical:

I. Introduction: Joy in the new addition (1-19) (*hymnal style*)
  A. Joy of Naples (1-5)
  B. Joy of Puteoli and Sorrento (6-11)
  C. Joy of family of Menecrates (12-19)
    1. brother of Menecrates, and Polla (12-14a)
    2. father of the child (14b-15a)
    3. the new masters of the house (15b-16a)
    4. the household as a whole (16b-19)

II. The three children (20-31) (*personal style*)
  A. The *ius trium liberorum* was an omen (20-22a)
  B. Three times has Lucina visited the house (22b-24)
  C. The three children (25-31)

III. Statius' complaint (32-44) (*personal style*)
  A. Why did I not find out earlier about the birth? (32-40a)
  B. The fault is yours, Menecrates (40b-42a)
  C. But I give in: your brood defends you! (42b-44)

IV. Conclusion: Prayer for the house of Menecrates (45-62) (*hymnal style*)
  A. Invocation (45-53)
  B. Wishes (54-58)
  C. Reasons why the wishes deserve to be granted (59-62).

---

[25] Vollmer, *P. Papinii Statii Silvarum Libri*, 484-485.

Each of the poem's four main structural divisions is tripartite. Longer end panels written in a style which we may designate hymnal because of the wishes and prayers contained in them, frame briefer central sections exhibiting a more intimate style. In opposition to these elements of symmetry is the fact that the balancing sections are of slightly unequal length. The poem begins with a long section of 19 verses, which is followed by a briefer, more personal section of 12 verses (20-31). This is succeeded in turn by another brief, intimate section (32-44) of thirteen verses. The final long section (45-62) contains 18 verses. There seems to be a deliberate effort to secure perfect overall symmetry while consciously avoiding exact equality of the parts.

The structure of *Silvae* IV. 8 is further unusual in that the end panels are longer than the sections which they frame. The central panel in poetic structures in the *Silvae* is almost without exception longer than the sections which frame it. The brevity of the central sections of IV. 8 in contrast to the length of the Introduction and Conclusion may be a structural device for contrasting the intimate, personal subject matter of these sections with the hymnal manner of the end panels.[26]

C. *Epithalamium*

Silvae I. 2 *Epithalamium in Stellam et Violentillam,* Statius' only wedding poem, is a composition of unusual complexity. The intricacy of this poem arises from the frequent shifts in location from earth to heaven and back, and from the intimate union of divine and human personages in the poem which results from these shifts in locale. Statius is eager to show that the union of Stella and Violentilla is a marriage made in heaven with the full sanction of the gods, and to make this point he portrays the human and divine worlds in close communion.

In his fine study of this *epithalamium,*[27] David Vessey has worked out the structure of the composition accurately and in detail. He divides it into thirteen sections:

---

[26] The significance of the structural anomalies exhibited by *Silvae* IV. 7 and 8 for the question of the publication of the books of the *Silvae* is discussed in Chapter V, 128-129.

[27] David W. T. C. Vessey, "Aspects of Statius' Epithalamion," *Mnemosyne* Ser. IV, 25 (1972), 172-187.

1-23	Gods and goddesses descend to honor the wedding; bride handed over to husband.
24-50	Stella will have great happiness, as a reward for his constancy. The poet will tell the cause of the joy.
51-64	Venus in her chamber. She is addressed by a Cupid.
65-102	Stella's case pleaded with an encomium on his constancy.
103-139	Venus accedes to the pleas in a speech lauding Violentilla.
140-161	Venus descends to earth and comes to Violentilla's house, where she finds her in her bedchamber.
162-193	Venus pleads for Stella, with an encomium on his personal merits and on the advantages of marriage.
194-200	Violentilla's heart is softened.
201-218	Stella's happiness is again described.
219-246	Gathering of gods and men for the wedding; the ceremony itself is treated.
247-255	The poets are summoned to celebrate the day.
256-265	Reasons why the poet is impelled to write for Stella and Violentilla.
266-277	Prayer for offspring and slow onset of age.[28]

Verses 51-200 form an extended aetiological myth framed by two pairs of balancing sections: verses 1-23, an account of a gathering of gods, are balanced by a second such gathering in 219-246; the report of Stella's happiness in verses 24-50 recurs in 201-218. In the αἴτιον, 51-64 balance 140-161, for in 52-53, we see Venus resting in her chamber after the departure of Mars, while in 161, Violentilla is portrayed resting alone. Verses 65-102 and 162-193 are matching *suasoriae* with encomia on Stella. Finally, 103-139 are balanced by 194-200: Venus' acceptance of her son's plea on behalf of Stella leads inevitably to Violentilla's resolve to marry. It is noteworthy that the balancing sections are, as is regularly the case in the *Silvae*, of approximately but not exactly equal length (1-23 = 23 verses, 219-246 = 28 verses; 24-50 = 27 verses, 201-218 = 18 verses). Vessey thus represents the structure which he has detected:[29]

A	B	a	b	c	>	<	a	b	c	B	A.
1-23	24-50	51-64	65-102	103-139			140-161	162-193	194-200	201-218	219-246

He separates verses 247-277 from the earlier part of the poem as containing the actual *epithalamium*, to which all the earlier material of the poem is preparatory.

---

[28] *Ibid.*, 185.

[29] *Ibid.*, 186.

Vessey's analysis pertains solely to the overall structure of the poem and does not take into consideration the question of paragraph organization. The opening paragraph of the poem (1-23), however, deserves particular attention because of its perfectly balanced parallel structure. The use of parallel or ABCABC organization is somewhat less common in the *Silvae* than is the use of ring-composition, but as Vessey shows, it is the principle upon which the aetiological central panel (51-200) of *Silvae* I. 2 is built. We may represent the structure of verses 1-23:

A Whence comes this song? (1-3a) — A Now I know! (16-17a)
B Entry of the gods (3b-10) — B Entry of the gods (17b-19a)
C The bride (11-12) — C The bride (19b-21)
D Venus' care for the bride (13-15) — D Stella's care for the bride (22-23).

The opening paragraph begins with two questions designed to catch the reader's attention at once and plunge him directly into the action of the poem (1-3a):

> Vnde sacro Latii sonuerunt carmine montes?
> cui, Paean, nova plectra moves humeroque comanti
> facundum suspendis ebur?

The questions are partially answered by the poet's account of the descent of the gods from Helicon (3b-10). The occasion of the festivities is a wedding (3b-6):

> procul ecce canoro
> demigrant Helicone deae quatiuntque novena
> lampade sollemnem thalamis coeuntibus ignem
> et de Pieriis vocalem fontibus undam.

The bride appears briefly as the charge of Venus (11-12):

> ipsa manu nuptam genetrix Aeneia ducit
> lumina demissam et dulci probitate rubentem.

The first half of the opening paragraph closes with Venus' preparations for the bride (13-15). Statius explains that Venus obligingly moderates her own beauty in order not to detract attention from the bride:

> ipsa toros et sacra parat cestoque Latino
> dissimulata deam crinem vultusque genasque
> temperat atque nova gestit minor ire marita.

In the eight verses which follow, the four themes of the preceding fifteen verses reappear in the order of their first appearance. The poet's inquiry into the cause of the festivities is fully answered at last: it is Stella's marriage that has the gods astir (16-17a):

> Nosco diem causasque sacri: te concinit iste
> (pande foris!), te, Stella, chorus.

Once again Statius catalogues the gods participating at the ceremony, but here he associates them specifically with Stella (17b-19a):

> tibi Phoebus et Euhan
> et de Maenalia volucer Tegeaticus umbra
> serta ferunt.

Now Amor and Gratia attend his bride (19b-21):

> nec blandus Amor nec Gratia cessat
> amplexum niveos optatae coniugis artus
> floribus innumeris et olenti spargere nimbo.

The paragraph closes with the union of Stella and his bride (22-23). The device of separately introducing and treating the principal characters, and then uniting them at the end of the structural unit (Stella and his bride are first mentioned together in verses 22-23), recalls Statius' procedure in *Silvae* II. 7. 107-135, in which Lucan appears first alone, then Polla's faithfulness to him is praised, and finally the two are united.

Silvae I. 2 is unusual among Statius' occasional poems because of the large amount of exact or close verbal parallelism between its balancing sections. This phenomenon is particularly prevalent in the balancing sections 1-23 and 219-246. In both of these sections, the divine guests at the wedding of Stella and Violentilla descend from heaven. *Euhan* is the final word of both verse 17 and verse 220, and the descriptions of the mountains sending their hordes are likewise similar. In the latter account, the mountains themselves release their inhabitants (221):

> hic movet Ortygia, movet hic rapida agmina Nysa.

At the beginning of the poem, the goddesses *demigrant Helicone* (4). Statius' account of the arrival of the human guests in 47-50 also closely parallels his later description of their arrival (232-235). In 47, the portals of the house are astir with guests (*fervent postes*), while in 230, the verb reappears of the house itself (*fervet domus*). Exact and even close verbal echoes are rare in the *Silvae*, and their appearance here must have special point in the *epithalamium*. It is possible that it represents a vestige of a ritual refrain such as might be included in a wedding song actually intended to be sung at a wedding or in a literary imitation of such a composition. One thinks of the refrain *o Hymen Hymenaee* in Catullus' *epithalamium* on the marriage of Manlius and Aurunculeia or of the refrain *Hymen o Hymenaee, Hymen ades o Hymenaee!* which closes each stanza of Catullus LXII.

D. *Propemptica*

In both of Statius' *propemptica,* a temporal structure, indicating the time of each stage of the action, supplements the physical structure of the compositions. In *Silvae* III. 2 *Propempticon Maecio Celeri,*[30] an overall thematic organization in which sections written in a hymnal style alternate with sections in a personal style is complemented by a temporal structure moving from pre-departure time to the anticipated time of Celer's return:

I. Prayer to gods of sea *before departure*: *Hymnal style* (1-49)
II. Parting of friends *at departure*: *Personal style* (50-60)
III. Dangers of the voyage *under way*: *Personal style* (61-100)
  A. τόπος of the dangers of seafaring (61-77)
    1. The boldness of men
    2. The anger of the gods
  B. The friends (78-100)
    1. Celer
    2. Statius
IV. Prayer to Isis for Celer's *arrival and stay*: *Hymnal style* (101-126)
V. Expected reunion of friends *on return*: *Personal style* (127-143).

The structure of the prayer with which the poem opens (1-49) foreshadows the organization of the entire composition, for it too exhibits a temporal progression in which a movement from pre-departure time, to the departure, to Celer's arrival in Egypt is in evidence. Each of the sections of the prayer invokes a different set of gods, reflecting the wish that the poet is making for Celer's journey:

---

[30] In my discussion of *Silvae* III. 2 *Prompempticon Maecio Celeri,* I have been unable to take into account the findings of Hanna Szelest's article, "De P. Papinii Statii ad Metium Celerem Carmine Observationes Aliquot," *Meander* 29 (1969), 335-344, which is written in Polish. The Latin summary of the article found at the end of the issue, p. 373, indicates that it deals with the position of *Silvae* III. 2 in the tradition of the *propempticon,* and argues that, although Statius retained some commonplaces of the genre, he made his poem unlike other compositions in the genre by his addition of elements from epic and travel literature.

I. I hand Celer to you, Neptune (5-8a)
PRE-DEPARTURE-TIME reflected in *transferre parat* (8)
II. Grant him kind stars, Castor and Pollux (8b-12)
III. A. You, too, Nereids, flock toward the shore. Investigate upon which ship he delights to embark (13-20).
DEPARTURE-TIME reflected in *scandere gaudet* (20).
  B. His ship came lately from Egypt (21-24): *CELER*
  C. Divide your duties, some on the sails, some at the ropes (25-34)
IV. Let Proteus, Triton, and Glaucus attend him to smooth the waters (35-41)
V. Let favorable winds blow till he reaches Egypt (42-49)
ARRIVAL-TIME reflected in *assignet carbasa ripis* (49)

The *propempticon* contains no real introduction. The direct address to the gods which Statius utters in verses 5-49 is introduced by 1-4, but these verses are by no means an introduction to the entire composition since they are directly connected in sense to the speech. The reason for this structural anomaly lies in the circumstances of the poem. Celer is undertaking a voyage by sea, a bold action, in the opinion of the ancients, and needs the assistance of all the gods who take care of those who travel the sea. Statius summons them at the beginning of the poem (1-4):

Di quibus audacis amor est servare carinas
saevaque ventosi mulcere pericula ponti,
sternite molle fretum placidumque avertite votis
concilium, et lenis non obstrepat unda precanti.

By invoking all the deities who might render assistance to Celer, Statius seeks to establish at once his sympathy with the addressee of his poem. The prayer contains another, more subtle hint of the poet's regard for Celer, for in it Statius has buried verbal allusions to Horace's *propempticon* for Vergil on his departure for Greece (*Odes* I. 3). Statius entrusts his friend to Neptune in language heavily influenced by Horace (5-8a):

grande tuo rarumque damus, Neptune, profundo
depositum, iuvenis dubiae committitur alno
Maecius atque animae partem super aequora nostrae
maiorem transferre parat.

Statius' choice of *grande rarumque / depositum* (5-6) to indicate Celer's relationship to him at once recalls Horace's address to the ship carrying Vergil, *navis, quae tibi creditum / debes Vergilium* (*Odes* I. 3. 5-6), indicating the same conception of the friend as a treasure entrusted for safe keeping. Again, in calling Celer the greater part of his soul, *animae partem nostrae / maiorem* (7-8), Statius recalls Horace's description of Vergil, *animae dimidium meae* (*Odes* I. 3. 7-8), but outdoes the earlier poet's compliment by claiming that his friend is more than half his own soul. The friendship of Statius and Celer is, by means of literary allusions, raised to the level of one of the great friendships of Latin literature.

The bulk of the prayer (8b-49) is a catalogue of deities who are asked to guard Celer. Castor and Pollux are to grant him kind stars and to banish unfavorable constellations from the heavens (8b-12):

> proferte benigna
> sidera et antemnae gemino considite cornu,
> Oebalii fratres; vobis pontusque polusque
> luceat; Iliacae longe nimbosa sororis
> astra fugate, precor, totoque excludite caelo.

In the long central panel which follows (13-34), the Nereids are instructed to search out Celer's ship and tend it. In this central panel, Celer figures more prominently than in any other section of the prayer. The panel is tripartite, with Celer most conspicuous in the second of the three units (21-24), where the reader learns that the ship which will carry Celer has recently come to Italy from Egypt laden with goods. Structure is used in the panel to reinforce sense. In verse 18, the Nereids are asked to surround Celer (*ambite*). The opening unit of the central panel (13-20) portrays the goddesses searching out upon which ship Celer is to depart, while in the closing unit (25-34) they are instructed to divide their duties, some stretching the rigging and others adjusting the topsails. The account of Celer and his ship is structurally framed by the poet's two sets of instructions to the Nereids, just as Celer is himself surrounded by the officious deities. Temporally, the prayer has moved forward from pre-departure time to the moment of departure, as Celer embarks joyfully (*scandere gaudet*, 20).

In 35-41, the Emperor's minister is at sea. Proteus, Triton, and Glaucus are asked to smooth the waters for his course, but Palaemon is to be especially favorable, if Statius is to sing of Palaemon's own Thebes (39-41). This is the first reference in the poem to the *Thebaid*, and prepares the way, in accordance with the poet's technique of gradually introducing and unfolding his themes, for slightly longer treatment of this subject which forms the closing lines of the composition (142-143). The verbal parallelism between the two passages is striking:

si vestras amor est mihi pandere Thebas (40),
quaeve laboratas claudat mihi pagina Thebas (143).

The prayer closes (42-49) with a plea to the winds to blow favorably till Celer reaches Egypt. The closing lines of the prayer mark Celer's arrival in Egypt and thus complete the temporal structure of the prayer (48b-49):

donec tua turbine nullo
laesa Paraetoniis assignet carbasa ripis.

In *Silvae* III. 4 *Capilli Flavi Earini*, what we may term a spatial structure supplements the simultaneous formal and temporal structures, for the action of the piece shifts between Rome and Pergamum:

Spatial Structure	*Formal Structure*	*Temporal Structure*
Rome	I. Hair to Pergamum (1-20)	Present
	A. Address to hair (1-5)	
	B. Address to Asclepius (6-11)	
	C. Address to Pergamum (12-20)	
Pergamum	II. Αἴτιον (22-77)	Past
	A. Pergamum (21-46)	
	1. Setting of scene (21-25)	
	2. Earinus' beauty (26-32a)	
	3. Earinus and Domitian (32b-46)	
Rome	B. Rome (47-64)	
	1. Arrival in Rome (47-49)	
	2. Venus decks out Earinus (50-56a)	
	3. Earinus as cupbearer (56b-64)	
	C. Castration (65-77)	
	III. Cutting of hair (78-106)	Return to present
	A. Preparations (78-90a)	
	B. Cutting of hair (90b-98)	
	C. Prayer to Asclepius (99-106)	

The opening and closing sections of the poem (1-20 and 78-106) are thematically linked by their discussion of Earinus' hair, a subject which disappears entirely in the long central panel (22-77). A shift in addressee marks the divisions of the tripartite opening section: verses 1-5 address Earinus' hair (*comae*, 1); 6-11 Asclepius (*iuvenis Phoebeie*, 6); 12-20 Pergamum (*Pergame*, 12). The first twenty verses of the poem deal with the journey of the hair to Pergamum and take place in present time. The location of the action, however, shifts at verse 6 from Rome to Pergamum. This opening section of the poem thus portrays in brief compass the entire journey of the hair from departure to destination and reflects in miniature the structure of the entire poem. In this respect, the opening section of III. 4 resembles the first structural division of III. 2 (1-49) which foreshadows the development of that *propempticon.*

In the final section of the poem (78-106), Statius returns, by the device of ring-composition, to the topic of Earinus' hair. The temporal sequence of the poem advances from the distant past when Earinus was castrated, through the recent past when his hair was shorn, to the present, while hopes are expressed for the future in the young man's prayers for the Emperor. The prayers with which the poem ends are rather conventional in phraseology and express sentiments similar to those voiced in other prayers in the *Silvae.* When Earinus asks that Domitian be granted years to equal the lifespan of Priam and Nestor, *annos / Iliacos Pyliosque simul* (103-104), he is echoing Statius' prayer that Manilius Vopiscus may surpass the years of Nestor, *finem Nestoreae egrediare senectae* (*Silvae* I. 3. 110) and that Rutilius Gallicus may outdo the lifespan of Priam and Nestor, *Troica / saecula transcendere / Nestoreosque situs* (*Silvae* I. 4. 125-127).

The relative brevity and conventionality of the end panels of *Silvae* III. 4 serve to highlight the elaborate αἴτιον which forms the poem's long central panel (22-77) and explains the origin of the connection of Earinus with the Roman imperial family. The closing verses of the opening section of the poem signal that a *causa* is to be explained. It is not without the will of heaven that Domitian enjoys the pleasure of Earinus' service (19b-20):

Nec tanta potenti
terrarum domino divum sine mente voluptas.

These lines provide us with a clue that Domitian will figure as prominently in the αἴτιον as will Earinus. As in the opening and closing sections of the poem, so in the αἴτιον the locale of the action helps to determine the division of the three subsections of the central panel. Verses 21-46, which take place in Pergamum, detail Venus' deliberations concerning who would be a suitable master for so handsome a youth as Earinus. The goddess' words foreshadow the extraordinary affection which Earinus may expect in the household of the Emperor (37b-38):

nec te plebeia manebunt
iura: Palatino famulus deberis amori.

The central section of the αἴτιον (47-64) is carefully structured in such a way as to show that Domitian is the poet's main concern, even though Earinus is ostensibly his subject. The section is built upon a regular alternation of discussion of Domitian with discussion of Earinus:

I. Arrival in Rome (47-49): *DOMITIAN*
II. Venus decks out Earinus (50-56a)
    A. Earinus' dress (*vestis*, 51) (50-52)
    B. *DOMITIAN* (53-54)
    C. Earinus' dress (*amictus*, 55) (55-56a)
III. Earinus as cupbearer (56b-64): *DOMITIAN*

The poet's account of the young man's arrival in Rome is a brief encomium upon Domitian's building program (47b-49):

> iam Latii montes veterisque penates
> Evandri, quos mole nova pater inclitus urbis
> excolit et summis aequat Germanicus astris.

Venus wonders how best to ready Earinus to meet such a master. In 50-52, she focuses her attention entirely upon Earinus:

> tunc propior iam cura deae, quae forma capillis
> optima, quae vestis roseos accendere vultus
> apta, quod in digitis, collo quod dignius aurum.

The goddess is concerned because she knows Domitian's radiant beauty and has herself joined the Emperor and his wife in marriage. Her thoughts are now of Domitian (53-54):

> norat caelestis oculos ducis ipsaque taedas
> iunxerat et plena dederat conubia dextra.

In verses 55-56a, Venus' attention turns again to Earinus' appearance (*amictus*, 55) so the central panel of the section closes, as it had begun, with discussion of Earinus.

Even in the poet's portrayal of Earinus as cupbearer, Domitian is the real subject and the praise of the Emperor is Statius' primary intention. The signal honor accorded Earinus of being able to touch Domitian's hand proves the love which heaven bears for Earinus (60-63a):

> Care puer superis, qui praelibare verendum
> nectar et ingentem totiens contingere dextram
> electus quam nosse Getae, quam tangere Persae
> Armeniique Indique petunt!

E. *Soteria*

Silvae I. 4 *Soteria Rutili Gallici* is one of the most elaborate and carefully constructed compositions in Statius' collection of occasional verse:

- I. Introduction (1-18)
  - 1-2 Justice: fate not inexorable
  - 3 Gallicus lives
  - 4 Domitian the favorite of the gods
  - 5-7 Gallicus could not be removed from *ministerium*
  - 7-8 he has shed old age and is strengthened
  - 9-14 joy in Rome
  - 15 long will he remain as his years return
  - 15 Gallicus lives
  - 16 his *custodia Romae*
  - 17-18 no *crimen* need be imputed to the fates
- II. Rutilius as the poet's inspiration; accept my gift (19-37)
  - 19 -22 *ministra vires animumque*
  - 23 -25a for you grant glory and understanding
  - 25b-30 you can provide better inspiration than Pirene
  - 31 -34a come, accept my poem as the gods accept gifts
  - 34b-37 do not spurn my lowly song. *Abundas opibus fandi*
- III. Fear of Rome for Rutilius (38-49)
  - 38 -39a Gallicus' character inspires love
  - 39b-42 those who love and fear for him: *patrumque equitumque notavi / lumina*
  - 43 -48a his character as an official
  - 48b-49 Gallicus' character inspires love
- IV. Causes of the illness (50-57)
  - 50 -52a the illness
  - 52b-56a *pro Caesare curae* caused the illness
  - 56b-57 the illness
- V. Αἴτιον on illness (Speech of Apollo) (58-105)
  - 58 -61a Introduction
  - 61b-68 we must save Rutilius
  - 69 -93 *laudes Rutili*
  - 94 -105 we will save Rutilius. Means to be used
- VI. Recovery from illness (106-114)
  - 106 -107a languishing Rutilius
  - 107b-108 gods work
  - 109 -110 cure effected
  - 111 -112a Rutilius aids the gods
  - 112b-114 his speedy recovery
- VII. Statius' fear for Rutilius (115-122)
  - Poet's watchful eyes took in everything: *lumine aucupor* (119-20)
- VIII. Rutilius as the poet's inspiration; accept my gift (123-131)

The first eighteen verses of *Silvae* I. 4, which form a self-contained introduction to the *soteria* and comprise one of the two main structural units of the poem, illustrate several compositional techniques which Statius most favors in the *Silvae*. The introduction shows complete thematic balance of ideas around a longer central panel. At the same time, however, the perfect overall symmetry of the introduction is offset by the fact that Statius has made no effort to achieve exact correspondence in the length of the balancing sections. Thus the ideas of verses 1-8 recur in chiastic order in four verses (15-18), and the central panel (9-14) forms the thematic but not the physical center of the introduction. Strengthening the opposition between symmetry and asymmetry is the poet's studious avoidance of exact verbal repetition between the balancing sections:

Justice returns: fate (*Clotho*) not inexorable	(1-3a)
Gallicus lives (*sidera cernit*)	(3b-4a)
The gods love you, Domitian	(4b-5a)
He could not be removed as *minister*	(5b-6a)
He has shed age (*fila senectae / exuit*)	(6b-8)
All feel joy at recovery of Gallicus	(9-14)
His youth returns (*aevo redeunte*)	(15)
Long shall he live (*manebit*)	(15)
He holds the *custodia Romae*	(16)
No *crimen* need be imputed to *fatis*	(17-18).[31]

The central panel expresses the idea which is thematically central to the introduction of the *soteria*: that all Rome should feel joy at the recovery of Rutilius Gallicus. The subject matter of the central panel is not directly stated in the end sections which frame the panel, and its particular importance to the introduction is underlined by the fact that, unlike the sections which frame it, the central panel forms only one sentence. For the first time in the poem, moreover, Statius addresses Gallicus directly in the panel (*sinum tuum*, 10; *tua iura*, 12). Before and after the central panel, Statius employs the third-person narrative technique when referring to Gallicus (*videt Gallicus*, 3-4; *stat*, 6; *exuit*, 8; *manet*, 15; *manebit*, 15). Again Statius has used syntax to reinforce structure in the *Silvae.*

---

[31] It is interesting to note that the reference to Domitian (4b-5a) finds no parallel in the introduction. Nowhere else in the *soteria* is Domitian mentioned, and one may well wonder why the poet has chosen to assure the Emperor that he is indeed favored by heaven. The answer probably lies in the fact that, as *praefectus urbis*, Gallicus was second in power only to the Emperor himself, as Statius makes clear when he calls him *proxima cervix* (6). The poet may inject this reassuring reference to the Emperor to allay any fears he may have had concerning his powerful minister's ambitions. In composing the *Silvae*, Statius was frequently placed in the difficult position of desiring to magnify the accomplishments of powerful servants of the Emperor without appearing to portray them as too ambitious and thereby arousing the suspicions of the Emperor.

The first eighteen verses serve also to introduce the reader to a number of the themes which Statius will expand and develop at length in the course of the poem. The fact that Gallicus has recovered from illness with the help of the gods, which forms the theme of verses 1-4a, reappears at great length in the poet's account of the official's illness and recovery (50-114), while the joy felt by Rome's people (9-14) is expanded in detail in verses 43-49 and in the extended encomium upon Gallicus which comprises verses 69-93.

The structure of the second main division of the *soteria*, which forms the remainder of the composition (19-131), is similar to the organization of *Silvae* III. 4 *Capilli Flavi Earini.* As in the *propempticon*, briefer end sections frame a long central panel consisting of an αἴτιον (58-105) highlighted both by its position between the chiastically-arranged end sections and by the fact that in it the gods themselves speak.

In the section which immediately follows the introduction, Statius calls upon Rutilius for inspiration (19-37). These verses provide a striking example of the climactic development of ideas which is a characteristic structural device in Roman literature of the Empire. The opening verses of the section explain that Statius calls not upon the gods but upon Rutilius for inspiration (19-23a):

> Ast ego nec Phoebum, quamquam mihi surda sine illo
> plectra, nec Aonias decima cum Pallade divas
> aut mitem Tegeae Dircesve hortabor alumnum:
> ipse veni viresque novas animumque ministra,
> qui caneris.

In the following eight verses (23b-30), Statius describes why Rutilius is particularly suited to lend inspiration to the poet. It is by will of the gods that Rutilius has given such glory to the Roman toga (23b-25a):

> docto nec enim sine numine tantus
> Ausoniae decora ampla togae Centumque dedisti
> iudicium mentemque Viris.

Statius therefore needs only the heady drafts of Rutilius' own fountain to provide him with sufficient inspiration (27b-28a):

largos potius mihi gurges in haustus
qui rapitur de fonte tuo.

The poet finally exhorts the great man to accept his gift, since Ceres, Bacchus, Diana, and Mars accept the gifts of the Romans (31-34a):

quare age, si Cereri sua dona merumque Lyaeo
reddimus, et dives praedae tamen accipit omni
exuvias Diana tholo captivaque tela
Bellipotens.

Almost imperceptibly, Statius has moved from the notion that Rutilius is a favorite of the gods (*nec sine numine tantus*, 23) to the assertion that he is himself like a god, to be honored with offerings. The idea that Rutilius deserves such honors as the gods receive reappears in the final section of the poem (123-131) which balances verses 19-37. In the concluding verses of the *soteria*, Statius expresses doubt that he can render a suitable offering to the prefect, but reminds him that the gods themselves often find pleasure in simple offerings (130b-131):

sed saepe deis hos inter honores
caespes et exiguo placuerunt farra salino.

In the αἴτιον (58-105), Apollo enlists the aid of Asclepius in curing Rutilius Gallicus, and the cure is effected in verses 106-114. This brief section deserves particular attention because of the care which Statius has lavished upon it. The balance of the parts is impressive:

106 -107a	Gallicus languishing
107b-108	Gods work on the cure
109 -110	The cure is effected
111 -112a	Rutilius aids the cure
112b-114	His speedy recovery.

Statius has given special dignity to the section by building it in large part from allusions to epic battle scenes. Rutilius is by implication compared to epic heroes healed by gods, thereby heightening the importance of his recovery. The section opens with a brief description of the prefect's weakened state (106-107a):

Dixerat. inveniunt positos iam segniter artus
pugnantemque animam.

The phrase *pugnantemque animam* recalls Lucan's account of sailors perishing in the battle before Massilia (*Bellum Civile* III. 578-579):

hic luctantem animam lenta cum morte trahentes
fractarum subita ratium periere ruina.

The gods thereupon prepare themselves to heal Rutilius (107b-108):

> ritu se cingit uterque
> Paeonio monstrantque simul parentque volentes.

Statius' choice of words here is influenced by Vergil's account of Iapyx' healing of Aeneas. Iapyx, like Statius' Apollo and Asclepius, "girds himself in Paeonian fashion" (*Aeneid* XII. 400-401):

> ille retorto
> Paeonium in morem senior succinctus amictu.

The cure of Rutilius is effected triumphantly (109-110):

> donec letiferas vario medicamine pestis
> et suspecta mali ruperunt nubila somni.

The cure, of central importance in the paragraph, occupies the thematic center of the paragraph. It is followed by statements which balance the earlier references to Rutilius' languishing state and the work of the gods in healing him. Whereas the gods worked for Rutilius' recovery in 107b-108, here Statius sets forth Rutilius' own part in his recovery (111-112a):

> adiuvat ipse deos morboque valentior omni
> occupat auxilium.

The paragraph ends with a mythological point which suggested itself naturally to the poet from the epic subject matter of the preceding lines. Not Telephus, not Menelaus was healed more quickly (112b-114):

> citius non arte refectus
> Telephus Haemonia, nec quae metuentis Atridae
> saeva Machaonio coierunt vulnera suco.

Statius' "shuddering son of Atreus" (*metuentis Atridae*, 113) recalls Homer's description of Menelaus' horror at beholding his wound (*Iliad* IV. 150):

> ῥίγησεν δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἀρηΐφιλος Μενέλαος.

The closing lines of the paragraph thus form a contrasting balance to the account of the lethargy of Rutilius with which the section opened. The slowness occasioned by the illness (*segniter*, 106) is explicitly contrasted with the speed of his recovery (*non citius*, 112).[32]

---

[32] Francis Cairns, *Generic Composition*, 154, has also detected a ring-composition structure in *Silvae* I. 4 which does not, however, agree in all details with that which we have suggested. Cairns offers the following division:

F. *Descriptive Poems*

Up to this point, we have examined a number of the *Silvae* which had heretofore not been investigated as a group from any standpoint. Some of the poems had not indeed been subjected to structural analysis at all. We have seen that these poems, which represent several poetic genres with differing rhetorical and poetic traditions, have in common a number of structural principles and compositional techniques. Now we shall discuss those poems which contain extensive descriptions (ἐκφράσεις) of buildings and art objects. These compositions, *Silvae* I. 1 *Equs Maximus Domitiani Imp.*, I. 3 *Villa Tiburtina Manili Vopisci*, I. 5 *Balneum Claudi Etrusci*, I. 6 *Kalendae Decembres*, II. 2 *Villa Surrentina Polli Felicis*, II. 3 *Arbor Atedi Melioris*, III. 1 *Hercules Surrentinus Polli Felicis*, IV. 3 *Via Domitiana*, and IV. 6 *Hercules Epitrapezios Novi Vindicis*, are the subject of studies by Hubert Cancik [33] and Hanna Szelest.[34] After a brief discussion of the findings of Cancik and Szelest concerning the structure of this group of the *Silvae*, we shall show that the basic structural principles by which Statius has organized these pieces differ not at all from the principles by which he structures the non-descriptive poems. We shall at the same time illustrate some of the structural devices which Cancik and Szelest have isolated as peculiar to the descriptive *Silvae*.

A^1	(1- 37)	Rejoicing and thanksgiving over Rutilius' cure
B^1	(38- 57)	General concern and prayers over Rutilius
C^1	(58- 68)	Apollo urges Asclepius to join him in curing Rutilius
D	(69- 93)	Encomium of Rutilius
C^2	(94-114)	Apollo and Asclepius cure Rutilius
B^2	(115-122)	Statius' own concern and prayers over Rutilius' illness
A^2	(123-131)	Rejoicing and thanksgiving over Rutilius and Statius' own thanksgiving.

Cairns has taken no notice of the considerable thematic correspondences which exist between the parts of verses 1-18 and cause these verses to stand independently as an introduction to the poem. Only verses 19-37 bear a thematic correspondence to 123-131. The remainder of the *soteria* exhibits far more numerous and exact parallels of theme than the rather general correspondences which Cairns has suggested, as our analysis makes clear. Finally, Cairns' division B^1 is faulty. Verses 50-57, which Cairns lumps with 38-49 as treating "general concern and prayers over Rutilius," do not treat this topic at all, but find an exact parallel in 106-114.

[33] Hubert Cancik, *Untersuchungen zur lyrischen Kunst des P. Papinius Statius* (Spudasmata, 13), Hildesheim, 1965. On Cancik's study, see also Chapter IV, 59-60. Cancik's discussion of the composition of the *Silvae* occupies mainly pages 23-37 of his study.

[34] Hanna Szelest, "Die Originalität der sog. beschreibenden *Silvae* des Statius," *Eos* 56 (1966 [1969]), 186-197.

Cancik's work is not primarily concerned with the structure of the descriptive poems but investigates these compositions as examples of the techniques of literary Mannerism and of the themes and language of Roman imperial cult. He does, however, offer some observations on the structure of the descriptive poems. Cancik notes that a tripartite structure, consisting of proem, midsection, and conclusion, is typical of the organization of the descriptive *Silvae*.[35] Main structural divisions in the poems are often bipartite,[36] and structural units may represent the passage of time through morning, evening, and night.[37] Finally, he has remarked upon the formalized sameness (Formelhaftigkeit) of the endings of the *Silvae* which consist for the most part of stock prayers and wishes.[38]

Szelest has observed that the descriptive elements in the poems regularly fall into two parts, a general description found early in the poem and an extensive description later in the composition.[39] Encomium upon the owner of the object under discussion is a central ingredient in the poems and is likewise bipartite, the most extensive segment occupying the end portion of the poem.[40] Characteristic of the encomium is the identification of the virtues of the object described with those of its owner, as the attractive location and careful choice of building materials reflect the builder's love of beauty and unpretentious luxury. Statius' descriptions are lacking in precision, selective and hardly useful for determining the floor plan of the building which they describe, for the poet tends to concentrate his attention upon fixtures or rooms which are for some reason particularly curious or unusual. Two qualities of the objects under discussion are regularly singled out for praise: brilliance and splendor, both of the buildings and of the building materials.

---

[35] Cancik, *Untersuchungen*, 67, terms a division of a poem into Proöm, Mittelteil, and Schluss a ". . . für die Sachlyrik des Statius typische Gliederung."

[36] *Ibid.*, 59.

[37] *Ibid.*, 101.

[38] *Ibid.*, 63-64.

[39] Szelest, "Originalität," 188, "Die Beschreibung zerfällt in der Regel in zwei Teile: einen allgemeinen und einen ausführlichen; meistens bilden diese kein geschlossenes Ganzes, sondern sind durch andere Elemente voneinander getrennt. Während die ausführliche Beschreibung sich gewöhnlich in der mittleren Gedichtspartie befindet, setzt der Dichter die allgemeine Beschreibung an den Anfang, in jedem Falle in den Teil, der der ausführlichen Beschreibung vorangeht."

[40] *Ibid.*, 191, "Das Enkomion auf Personen bildet, ähnlich wie die Beschreibung, kein geschlossenes Ganzes, sondern unterliegt einer Zergliederung; seinen wichtigsten und umfangreichsten Teil setzt Statius in die Endpartie des Gedichtes. . . ."

The third element of the Statian description which Szelest isolates is the poet's wish for health and long life for the owner. This element is frequently introduced by a formula like *macte* (*Silvae* I. 3. 106; I. 5. 63; III. 1. 166) or *vive / vivite* (II. 2. 121), and occupies the final verses of the poem, following the second part of the encomium on the owner.

We begin our discussion of the descriptive *Silvae* with an examination of *Silvae* III. 1 *Hercules Surrentinus Polli Felicis*, a poem of great structural complexity organized upon principles familiar to us from our discussion of the non-descriptive *Silvae*.[41] Statius has taken pains to ensure that the structural units of the poem are carefully constructed and fully integrated to form a perfectly balanced poetic whole. (See Chart on next page).

The αἴτιον (49-153) bears close thematic connections to both the introduction (1-22) and the conclusion (163-186) of *Silvae* III. 1. It is indeed a greatly expanded treatment of the themes broached in the introduction, for it tells how the temple briefly described in 1-22 was built at the request of Hercules. The first seven verses of the introduction display a marked climax of thought ending in a *sententia*. Pollius has left off worship of Hercules in order to build him a better temple. The temple is briefly characterized in a description telling the reader that the god's new dwelling place is not a miserable house on a bare shore or a stopover for sailors (1-4):

> Intermissa tibi renovat, Tirynthie, sacra
> Pollius et causas designat desidis anni,
> quod coleris maiore tholo nec litora pauper
> nuda tenes tectumque vagis habitabile nautis.

It is, rather, a brilliant dwelling, as bright as the pyre on Oeta (5-7):

> sed nitidos postis Graisque effulta metallis
> culmina, ceu taedis iterum lustratus honesti
> ignis ab Oetaea conscenderis aethera flamma.

---

[41] Cancik unaccountably omits from discussion in his book *Silvae* III. 1 *Hercules Surrentinus Polli Felicis*, which combines elements of the ἔκφρασις πραγμάτων and the ἔκφρασις τόπων. He relegates the poem to a footnote, *Untersuchungen*, 120 note 19.

- I. *Introduction* (1-22)
  Poet addresses Hercules:
  Pollius' care for Hercules
  - A. Pollius ends remiss worship and has built Hercules a worthy temple (1-7)
  - B. The temple (8-22)
    - I. The temple (8-11)
      - A. The sight can scarce be believed
      - B. Whence came this brilliant temple?
    - II. Construction of the temple (12-19a)
      - A. Pollius has outdone nature (12-15a)
      - B. Speed of construction (15b-19a)
        MYTH: Amphion
    - III. Hercules and the temple (19b-22)
      - A. Hercules did the work (19b-22a)
      - B. One would have thought his step-mother assigned him to it! (22b)
- II. *Invocation of Hercules* (23-48)
  - A. Summons of Hercules (23-28)
  - B. The temple (29-38)
    PRAISE OF POLLIUS
  - C. Summons of Hercules (39-43a)
  - D. The temple (43b-48)
    - I. There is a playground (43b-45)
    - II. Here is the name of the attendant (46-48)
- III. Αἴτιον (49-153)
  Brief invocation to Calliope (49-51)
  - A. Storm and refuge at old temple of Hercules (52-88)
  - B. Speech of Hercules (89-116)
    - I. Pollius has outdone nature but has neglected Hercules (91-102a)
    PRAISE OF POLLIUS
    - II. Build me a worthy temple, Pollius (102b-109)
    - III. I will help in the work (110-114)
    - IV. The work will progress swiftly (115-116)
      MYTH: Amphion
  - C. Construction of the temple (117-153)
- IV. *Invocation to Hercules* (154-162)
  - A. Come to the temple, Hercules (154-158a)
  - B. *PRAISE OF POLLA* (158b-162)
- V. *Conclusion* (163-186)
  - A. Introduction (163-165)
    - I. Statius brings his gift *ad aras*
    - II. Hercules introduced as speaking
  - B. Speech of Hercules (166-183)
    - I. Praise and thanks to Pollius
    - II. Hercules' thanks to Pollius and Polla
    - III. Hercules' special fondness for the temple
  - C. Conclusion (184-186)
    - I. Hercules finishes speaking
    - II. Hercules worships *altaribus*

As Szelest has noted of Statian descriptions, brilliance is prominent in the poet's description of the temple (*nitidos postis*, 5). The section ends with a reference to the pyre of Hercules on Oeta, the only specific reference to mythology in the first seven verses of the poem. Myth serves here not so much as a mere indication that the passage has come to an end, but rather as a device marking a pointed culmination of the ideas presented up to this point in the paragraph. Having begun with the statement that Pollius has ceased his remiss worship, the poet has built up to the notion that Pollius' new temple is as brilliant as Hercules' pyre:

I. Pollius ends remiss worship (1-2)
II. Hercules dwells now in no humble house (3-4)
III. But in a brilliant temple (5-6a)
IV. *MYTHOLOGICAL CLIMAX*: as bright as the pyre of Oeta (6b-7)

The second section of the introduction (8-22) constitutes what Szelest has termed the brief, general descriptive element. We learn now that the temple took shape with marvelous speed (17b-19a):

stupet ipse labores
annus, et angusti bis seno limite menses
longaevum mirantur opus.

The help which Hercules provides assures speed of construction (19b-22):

deus attulit arces
erexitque suas, atque obluctantia saxa
summovit nitens et magno pectore montem
reppulit.

In the long αἴτιον which forms the central panel of the poem, the themes of the brilliance of the temple, the speed of its construction, and the help rendered by Hercules reappear in expanded form. At the same time, the αἴτιον is thematically connected to the conclusion which, like the αἴτιον, contains a speech by Hercules containing praises of Pollius (166-183). The αἴτιον is tripartite. In the first section (52-88), we learn that Statius was visiting his friend Pollius in the sweltering heat of summer and studying Pollius' latest poetic productions (65-67):

facundique larem Polli non hospes habebam,
assidue moresque viri pacemque novosque
Pieridum flores intactaque carmina discens.

The language is reminiscent of Lucretius' account of the delight which he feels in treating a subject yet untried (*De Rerum Natura* I. 926-928):

avia Pieridum peragro loca nullius ante
trita solo. iuvat integros accedere fontis
atque haurire, iuvatque novos decerpere flores.

We know from Statius' description of Pollius Felix' studies at his estate in *Silvae* II. 2 *Villa Surrentina Polli Felicis* that Pollius was an Epicurean (112-113):

hic ubi Pierias exercet Pollius artes,
seu volvit monitus quos dat Gargettius auctor.

By his Lucretian allusion, Statius seems to hint that the two friends were discussing Epicureanism. Although there is no evidence to suggest that Statius was a professed follower of Epicurus, there is much to suggest that he would have sympathized with the ethical position of the school. Statius' love of the *pax* and refined *otium* valued by the school is everywhere evident in the *Silvae*, and in particular in those poems which describe elegant villas and estates where such pleasures abound. The peace and leisure which Statius craved were of course not the ascetic aloofness of Epicurus and Lucretius, but rather the quiet retirement spent in the company of the wealthy class of Roman society of which Pollius Felix and the other addressees of the *Silvae* were members. The desire for peace and leisure is not an empty literary commonplace in the *Silvae*, however, but is, for Statius, along with the support of the Emperor, a prerequisite for successful poetic activity. In *Silvae* I. 3 *Villa Tiburtina Manili Vopisci*, the poet praises the *docta otia* (108-109) of Vopiscus which enables him to meditate upon literary matters. The poet here specifically connects *otium* with art, lending support to Jean-Marie André's description of the nature of *otium* in Roman imperial times, "Ainsi, de réalité quotidienne, relative, complémentaire de l'activité, l'*otium* romain tend à devenir, au premier siècle de notre ère, un accomplissement de l'humanité, au double sense d'*humanitas*: 'culture' et 'beauté humaine.'"[42]

While Statius and Pollius were engaging in conversation, a storm blew up and the two sought refuge in the humble shrine of Hercules on Pollius' estate. As soon as they were inside, Hercules appeared to them and delivered a speech which forms the second section of the αἴτιον (89-116). The device of having a god voice the poet's sentiments has the same purpose here as did the speech of Apollo in *Silvae* I. 4 *Soteria Rutili Gallici.* The poet lends greater credence to his words by allowing a god to deliver the encomium upon Pollius, and suggests that heaven is intimately concerned with the activities of his friends. Hercules begins by praising Pollius' success in beautifying his estate (97b-101):

---

[42] Jean-Marie André, *L'Otium dans la Vie Morale et Intellectuelle Romaine des Origines à l'Époque Augustéenne*, Paris, 1966, 541.

longo tu tramite nudos
texisti scopulos, fueratque ubi semita tantum,
nunc tibi distinctis stat porticus alta columnis.
ne sorderet iter, curvi tu litoris ora
clausisti calidas gemina testudine lymphas.

Not wishing to be forgotten by Pollius, the god begs him to erect for him a new temple (102b-109), and promises to help in the construction (112b-113):

ipse adero et conamina tanta iuvabo
asperaque invitae perfringam viscera terrae.

The god asserts that, with his help, the work will progress as swiftly as Amphion's building of the walls of Thebes (115-116a):

non Amphioniae steterint velocius arces
Pergameusve labor.

The reference to Amphion provides a direct thematic link to the introduction, in which Statius asks if the new temple rose with the help of the music of Amphion and Orpheus (16b-17a):

Tyrione haec moenia plectro
an Getica venere lyra?

The final section of the αἴτιον (117-153) details the speed with which the temple rose and carries out Hercules' promise, voiced in 15b-19a and again in expanded form in 110-116, that the work would progress swiftly with his help. The temple was completed so quickly because Hercules worked even under cover of night (125-128a):

hic pater ipse loci positis Tirynthius armis
insudat validaque solum deforme bipenni,
cum grave nocturna caelum subtexitur umbra,
ipse fodit.

In the final division of the poem (163-186), Hercules appears once again to reward Pollius and his wife Polla for the gift of the new temple. The last section of the piece is linked with the introduction and the αἴτιον by the god's praise of Pollius' conquest over nature (166-169a):

> macte animis opibusque meos imitate labores,
> qui rigidas rupis infecundaeque pudenda
> naturae deserta domas, et vertis in usum
> lustra habitata feris, foedeque latentia profers
> numina.

Divine personages are used as well in *Silvae* IV. 3 *Via Domitiana* to lend greater credibility to Statius' pronouncements. In this case, Domitian is the object of the poet's encomium. A speech by the river god Vulturnus occupies the central panel, while a prophecy by the Cumaean Sibyl comprises the poem's final section:

I. Introduction: The Road and its Builder (1-26)
  A. The road (1-3)
  B. Its builder (4-26)
II. The past state of the road (27-39)
  A. Faults of the old road (27-35) (*quondam,* 27)
  B. Changed state of the road (36-39) (*at nunc,* 36)
III. The Road and its Builder (40-96)
  A. The road (40-66)
    1. Technical details (40-48)
    2. Personal details of the workers (49-55)
    3. Heroic history (56-60)
    4. Hyperbole (61-66)
  B. The builder (69-96) (Speech of Vulturnus)
    Introduction (69-71)
    1. Domitian as lawgiver (72-75)
    2. Past *versus* present state of river (76-80)
    3. Domitian as lawgiver (81-87)
    4. Present state of river (89-94)
IV. Present state of road (97-113)
  A. Benefits from changed state of road (97-106)
  B. Let all nations use the road! (107-113)
V. Domitian (114-163)
  A. The road (124-138)
  B. The builder (139-163)

The two main themes of the introduction, the road and its builder, are expanded in the central panel in passages of almost but not exactly equal length (the road, 40-66: 27 verses; the builder, 67-96: 30 verses). Statius accords slightly more space to the Emperor, indicating by structural means that Domitian is the focus of his attention.

We noted in the case of the funeral laments that the picture of the Emperor as the guarantor of the peace and harmony of his citizens, eager to reward their faithfulness and to advance their careers, dominates Statius' conception of Domitian. It is in this guise of bringer of peace that Domitian first appears in *Silvae* IV. 3 (8-19):

> sed qui limina bellicosa Iani
> iustis legibus et foro coronat,
> qui castae Cereri diu negata
> reddit iugera sobriasque terras,
> qui fortem vetat interire sexum
> et censor prohibet mares adultos
> pulchrae supplicium timere formae,
> qui reddit Capitolio Tonantem
> et Pacem propria domo reponit,
> qui genti patriae futura semper
> sancit lumina Flaviumque caelum.[43]

The speech of Vulturnus is an expanded and developed form of this picture of Domitian. Vulturnus calls the Emperor *bone conditor* (72), the good orderer who caused the disorderly river (*me refusum,* 73) to keep its proper banks (*recti legibus alvei ligasti,* 75). The river has yielded and accepted Domitian as supreme lord and perpetual victor (81-87):

> sed gratis ago servitusque tanti est,
> quod sub te duce, te iubente, cessi,
> quod tu maximus arbiter meaeque
> victor perpetuus legere ripae.
> et nunc limite me colis beato
> nec sordere sinis malumque late
> deterges sterilis soli pudorem.

Statius borrows his language and conception of the Emperor from the language of Roman imperial cult.[44] Invincibility is one of the standing characteristics of the portrayal of the Emperor in official cult language and in the poet's portrayal of Domitian in the *Silvae.* At *Silvae* IV. 7. 49, he terms the Emperor *invictus*, and at IV. 8. 61-62, he links the idea of his invincibility with that of his divinity:

---

[43] I am following Vollmer and Mozley in adopting Turnebus' *caelum* against M's nonsensical *calvum* and Ellis' *clavum* which Phillimore adopts. Statius' words *qui gentis patriae futura semper / sancit lumina* refer, as do verses 16-17, to Domitian's building activity. Here Domitian's completion of the *templum gentis Flaviae* (see Suetonius *Domitian* 5) is under discussion. In *Silvae* V. 1. 240-241, Statius refers to the *templum gentis Flaviae* as the work of Domitian *aeternae modo qui sacraria genti / condidit inque alio posuit sua sidera caelo.* Since the poet there speaks of the *templum* as a *caelum,* we should probably read *caelum* in *Silvae* IV. 3. 19.

[44] Numerous studies treat the language and iconography of Roman imperial cult in the literature of the Empire. A thorough investigation of the establishment of a Flavian cult and of the cult usages of the Flavians

> si modo prona bonis invicti Caesaris adsint
> numina.

In the final section of the poem (114-163), Statius brings on the Cumaean Sibyl who delivers a speech which outdoes even the two earlier *laudes Domitiani* (8-19 and 67-96) in the claims which she makes for the Emperor. Her speech provides an instance of Statius' use of climax in the poem, for the aspect of Domitian's power upon which she focuses is his position as ruler of the universe. Seen earlier as builder (8-19) and giver of law and order (67-96), the Emperor appears now greater and more powerful than Nature herself (*natura melior potentiorque*, 135). The reason for the introduction of the Cumaean Sibyl is obvious. She is a being directly inspired by heaven whose word should be preferred to that of any mortal, as the poet specifically says (119-120):

> cedamus; chely, iam repone cantus:
> vates sanctior incipit, tacendum est.

The divine inspiration of her words is beyond question, and no better authority could be imagined to vouch for the truth of the poet's utterance on Domitian's divinity, his military prowess, and his preternaturally long life, which form the substance of her speech. As is regularly the case in the structure of the *Silvae,* the wishes for a long life for the addressee of the poem form the last verses of the composition, yet the Sibyl's prediction that Domitian can expect an extraordinarily long life (*magnus te manet ordo saeculorum*, 147) has special point in the case of an Emperor and is a manifestation of the language of the Roman imperial cult. Since the welfare of the entire empire depends upon that of the Emperor, long life is a natural boon to wish for Domitian. In *Silvae* IV. 2. 60-62, Statius expresses the same type of wish:

---

is provided by Kenneth Scott, *The Imperial Cult under the Flavians*, Stuttgart, 1936. Considerations of Statius' handling of imperial cult language include J. J. Hartmann, "De Domitiano Imperatore et de Poeta Statio," *Mnemosyne* 44 (1916), 338-372; Kenneth Scott, "Statius' Adulation of Domitian," *AJPh* 54 (1933), 247-259; Franz Sauter, *Der römische Kaiserkult bei Martial und Statius* (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, 21), Stuttgart, 1934; and Hubert Cancik, *Untersuchungen*, 65-115.

saepe annua pandas
limina, saepe novo Ianum lictore salutes,
saepe coronatis iteres quinquennia lustris!

Franz Sauter has suggested that Statius' emphasis on preternaturally long life as a characteristic of Domitian in the *Silvae* is a borrowing from Egyptian and Hellenistic imperial cult,[45] and that the concept of Domitian's immortality takes three forms in the *Silvae*: expressions involving terms like *diu-sero* to characterize the Emperor's term on earth and eventual reception into heaven; comparisons with long-lived mythic personages, especially Priam, Nestor, and Tithonus; and employment of terms like *saecula* to refer to his life-span.[46] The last two of these appear in the Sibyl's prophecy for Domitian (147-152):

magnus te manet ordo saeculorum,
natis longior abnepotibusque
annos perpetua geres iuventa
quos fertur placidos adisse Nestor,
quos Tithonia computat senectus
et quantos ego Delium poposci.

In *Silvae* I. 5 *Balneum Claudi Etrusci* and I. 6 *Kalendae Decembres*, Statius abandons ring-composition in the overall organization of the poems. His description of the luxurious bath of Claudius Etruscus is bipartite and consists of halves of almost but not exactly equal length (1-33: 33 verses; 34-65: 32 verses). The first half of the poem is an elaborate catalogue of gods whom Statius will and will not invoke:

1-5 Gods who will not be invoked
6-8a Gods who will be invoked
8b-18 The dedicatee of the poem
  A. Claudius Etruscus (8b-14)
  B. Invocation proper (15-18)
19-22 Gods who will not be invoked
23-30a Gods who will be invoked
MYTHIC CLIMAX: Venus and the bath (30b-33).

The first thirty-three verses form an introduction of surprising scope in proportion to the length of the entire poem, and display meticulous craftsmanship and symmetry. Enumerations of gods who will and who will not be invoked alternate in a parallel arrangement around a central panel (8b-18) which contains an account of the poet's friendship with Claudius and comprises the actual invocation. Statius uses the catalogues of gods and their attributes to aid him in introducing two themes which are treated at length in the second half of the composition: the fine workmanship of the bath, and its hot water, warmed by furnaces placed beneath the floor.

---

[45] Sauter, *Der römische Kaiserkult*, 128.

[46] *Ibid.*, 121.

Because he sings of the wonders of a heated bath, Statius explains that he will not call upon the Muses of Helicon or upon Phoebus or Bacchus, or other solemn gods, because his song requires another type of inspiration (*alios poscunt mea carmina coetus*, 5), that which the Naiads and Neptune provide (6-8a):

> Naidas, undarum dominas, regemque corusci
> ignis adhuc fessum Siculaque incude rubentem
> elicuisse satis.

The central panel of the first half of the poem contains the general descriptive element, in which Statius alludes briefly to the dazzling beauty of the bathhouse (12b-13), a theme expanded at length in 34-46. Here too stands the invocation to the "sea-green goddesses" (9b-16):

> dilecto volo lascivire sodali.
> iunge, puer, cyathos—set ne numerare labora—
> cunctantemque intende chelyn; discede Laborque
> Curaque, dum nitidis canimus gemmantia saxis
> balnea dumque procax vittis hederisque, soluta
> fronde verecunda, Clio mea ludit Etrusco.
> ite, deae virides, liquidosque advertite vultus
> et vitreum teneris crinem redimite corymbis.

In the second negative invocation (19-22), Statius banishes Salmacis who ravished Hermaphroditus and the nymphs who lured Hylas into their waters. The nymphs whom Statius wishes to invoke are the goddesses of Latium and the seven hills of Rome. The first half of the poem closes with an epigrammatic characterization of the heating system of the bath treated at length in 47-59. Venus guided the hand of Hephaestus in the construction of the bath and, lest a lowly flame heat the building, herself kindled the torches of her cupids beneath it (32b-33):

> ne vilis flamma caminos
> ureret, ipsa faces volucrum succendit amorum.

The second half of the poem, the ἔκφρασις (34-65), is structurally unusual in that it ends without a distinct concluding section. Verses 63b-65, which praise Claudius Etruscus' ingenuity in erecting such a bathhouse, follow naturally from the discussion of the bath which carries through verse 62a, and provide a somewhat truncated conclusion to the poem. The descriptive element itself falls into three sections: a long characterization of the *caldarium* which develops the theme of the beauty of the bathhouse (34-50), a shorter consideration of the *frigidarium* (51-56), and a very brief discussion of the underground heating system of the bath (57-59). The treatment of the *caldarium* offers a good illustration of the fact that Statian descriptions tend to be selective and lacking in precision. In the course of the description, only three aspects of the bath are touched upon, none of which pertains to the physical layout of the facilities. The types of marble found in the bath (34-40), the play of light on the walls (41-46), and the running water (47-50) form in turn the focus of the poet's attention. The discussion of the *frigidarium* occupies only a few verses which consist of *sententiae*. Venus would have preferred to be born here, and Narcissus would have seen himself more clearly here, while Hecate would enjoy bathing here, even if detected (54b-56):

> hoc mallet nasci Cytherea profundo,
> hic te perspicuum melius, Narcisse, videres,
> hic velox Hecate velit et deprensa lavari.

The return here of Venus (*Cytherea*, 54) recalls her appearance in verse 31, where the poet had claimed that the goddess guided her husband's hand in the construction of the bath.

Statius ends *Silvae* I. 5 as he does many of the descriptive poems, with wishes that the addressee of the poem may enjoy long life and rise to even greater heights of fame and success, as a man of his talents richly deserves (63b-65):

> macte, oro, nitenti
> ingenio curaque, puer! tecum ista senescant,
> et tua iam melius discat fortuna renasci!

In *Silvae* I. 6, Statius substitutes a temporal organizational principle for ring-composition in the format of the poem, although he makes skillful use as well of recessed panel organization in the structure of the sections of the poem. In this piece, Statius describes an elaborate feast and program of bizarre entertainments which he attended on the occasion of the Saturnalia. The impression which he seeks to convey is that of extraordinary and ever-increasing sumptuousness, which may account for the unusual structure of the poem. The composition begins at dawn (*vix aurora novos movebat ortus*, 9) and continues to the dark of night (*vixdum caerula nox subibat orbem*, 85). The earlier sections of the poem illustrate structural patterns common in the *Silvae*, but, as the temporal sequence of the poem advances and the spectacles which the poet witnesses and recounts become increasingly grotesque, there is a complete abandonment of balanced structuring in favor of simple cataloguing, as if Statius wishes to suggest the overwhelming succession of curiosities following one upon the other without respite.

The introduction of *Silvae* I. 6 (1-8) is followed by a brief characterization of the generosity of Domitian which serves as a general proem to the poet's account of the gifts which Domitian rained upon his guests that forms the remainder of the descriptive element of the poem (28-97). The structure of this brief section is remarkably symmetrical (9-27):

3 verses	9-11 "rain" of Domitian
4 verses	12-15 account of the gifts
1 verse	16 compliment to the generosity of Domitian
4 verses	17-20 account of the gifts
	21-24 *MYTH*: transition to imagery of imperial cult
3 verses	25-27 rain of Jupiter.

The open-handed generosity of Domitian is first likened to rain and the morning dew (9-11):

Vix aurora novos movebat ortus,
iam bellaria linea pluebant,
hunc rorem veniens profudit eurus.

The following four verses (12-15) list the pastries, nuts, and fruits gathered from Asia Minor and the far reaches of Italy which made up the Emperor's shower. A compliment to Domitian's generosity forms the central structural element (16):

largis gratuitum cadit rapinis.

Another four verses (17-20), more specific in their designation of the types of gifts involved than was the case in 12-15, follow this central panel of one verse:

molles gaioli lucuntulique
et massis Amerina non perustis
et mustaceus et latente palma
praegnantes caryotides cadebant.

The sole element of asymmetry in the structure of the section is provided by the extended simile in verses 21-24 which carries on the rain imagery present throughout the section. The bounty of Domitian outdoes the torrents sent by the Hyades and the Pleiades (21-22):

> non tantis Hyas inserena nimbis
> terras obruit aut soluta Plias.

The simile prepares the way for the hyperbolic conclusion of the section by implying the presence of Jupiter as god of rain. This association becomes explicit in the final three verses of the section. Jupiter's storms may threaten provided Rome's own Jove sends his showers (25-27):

> ducat nubila Iuppiter per orbem
> et latis pluvias minetur agris,
> dum nostri Iovis hi ferantur imbres.

In the ensuing sections of the descriptive panel, the careful balance of the poet's preliminary account of the Emperor's "rain" gives way to an extended list of a deluge of curious gifts and sights, including a performance of female wrestlers and dwarfs (51-64), a parade of musicians (65-74), and a show of exotic species of birds which snatch tidbits from the banquet tables (75-83). Here, in contrast to the poet's regular practice, the absence of balanced structure serves to reinforce the sense of the passage.

Statius' manner of describing objects in this group of poems enlivens the process of description and causes the beauty of the object detailed to reflect favorably upon the personality and good taste of its owner. The description of the table-top statue of Hercules owned by Novius Vindex comprises verses 32-58 of *Silvae* IV. 6. The greater part of the poet's "description" consists, however, of a discussion of Lysippus' success at portraying so much life in a statue only a foot tall. The poet's description of the overwhelming impression which the statue makes upon the viewer (32-36a) achieves its effect by an emotional crescendo reaching a climax in 35-36a. Verses 32-34a are a simple statement of the genuine charm of the statue:

> Haec inter castae genius tutelaque mensae
> Amphitryoniades multo mea cepit amore
> pectora.

The poet's language then becomes more subjective and emotional as he claims to be unable to get his fill of looking (34b):

> nec longo satiavi lumina visu.

In 35-36a, he is rhapsodic and excited by the majesty of the statue:

tantus honos operi finisque inclusa per artos
maiestas! deus ille, deus!

Lysippus' ability to create illusion is so complete that an imagined viewer of the statue cannot tell it from the god himself, exclaiming (40b-42):

"hoc pectore pressus
vastator Nemees; haec exitiale ferebant
robur et Argoos frangebant bracchia remos."

The remainder of the section devoted to the statue (47-58) is more or less descriptive, although the particulars of the statue's appearance from head to toe are confined to 55-58. The description begins with a three-verse characterization of what the statue is not. It is not such as the Telchines would produce, nor dull Brontes nor Hephaestus. The following five verses treat of the cheerful demeanor of the figure (*nec torva effigies epulisque aliena remissis*, 50). After the hyperbolic account of the effect of the statue upon the viewer, the brief and matter-of-fact description of the statue is somewhat disappointing. One almost wonders how such a figure could have occasioned the poet's ecstasy (55-58):

sic mitis vultus, veluti de pectore gaudens,
hortatur mensas. tenet haec marcentia fratris
pocula, at haec clavae meminit manus: aspera sedis
sustinet et cultum Nemeaeo tegmine saxum.

The rather perfunctory nature of the description illustrates the important point made by Szelest that, however fundamental description is in this group of the *Silvae*, it seldom constitutes the lengthiest segment of the poems.[47]

In Statius' two descriptions of villas, *Silvae* I. 3 *Villa Tiburtina Manili Vopisci* and II. 2 *Villa Surrentina Polli Felicis*, the poet identifies the virtues of the villas with those of their owners. The villa of Manilius Vopiscus is so well suited to its Epicurean owner that the waters which flow past the buildings fall silent as if to avoid disturbing the owner's philosophical meditations (I. 3. 20-23):

ipse Anien (miranda fides) infraque superque
saxeus hic tumidam rabiem spumosaque ponit
murmura, ceu placidi veritus turbare Vopisci
Pieriosque dies et habentis carmina somnos.

---

[47] Szelest, "Originalität," 188, "Die 'descriptio' ist hier das prinzipielle Element, aber nicht einmal das einzige, und bei der Mehrheit dieser Gedichte bildet sie nicht einmal ihren umfangreischsten Teil."

At the villa of Pollius Felix, the weather tempers itself so as not to disturb the owner, and the surrounding sea lies calm in imitation of the character of Pollius (II. 2. 28-29):

> hic praeceps minus audet hiems, nulloque tumultu
> stagna modesta iacent dominique imitantia mores.[48]

In a similar manner, Statius claims that the equestrian statue of Domitian is a delight to behold because it so perfectly reflects the Emperor's gentle demeanor (I. 1. 15b-16):

> iuvat ora tueri
> mixta notis belli placidamque gerentia pacem.

G. *Other Poems*

The remaining poems in the collection, some of which belong to genres represented by only one example in the *Silvae* while others can be traced to no distinct poetic genre, present interesting structural studies. Ring-composition appears in an unusual form in the introduction to *Silvae* IV. 2 *Eucharisticon ad Imp. Aug. Germ. Domitianum*, an expression of thanks, like I. 6, for an invitation to a dinner given by the Emperor. The introduction (1-17) is divided into halves of almost exactly equal length which contrast the famous mythic banquets of Dido and Alcinous with the seemingly divine banquet given by Domitian. The human and therefore describable is opposed to the divine and indescribable:

I. Earthly banquets (1-10a)
  A. Vergil—Dido
    : they could describe earthly banquets
     Homer—Alcinous
                EARTHLY HOST
  B. Statius and Caesar: the poet is at a loss for words at such a banquet
  A. Homer—Vergil
II. A seemingly divine banquet (10b-17) *A DIVINE HOST*
  A. Domitian—Jove in the stars
  B. Statius: this is the real beginning of his life
  A. Domitian at the table: the poet is overawed

---

[48] Hubert Cancik, "Eine epikureische Villa. Statius Silv. II 2: Villa Surrentina," *AU* 11, 1 (1968), 75, has noted this identification of villa and owner in *Silvae* II. 2, "So erscheint die Villa Surrentina als architektonisches Symbol für die Lebensform eines musischen Menschen, für epikureische Heiterkeit und Genusskultur, Unabhängigkeit und Ruhe."

It is surprising to find Statius in the center of each section since the poet usually plays down his own role within his poems. By thus placing himself in the center, Statius shows that he is the feted guest and emphasizes the difficulty of his task in commemorating the occasion, but at the same time pays a compliment to Domitian by indicating that the Emperor, the author of the poet's awe and joy, is in fact the focus of his attention.

Silvae V. 4 *Somnus*, the most widely-celebrated poem in the collection, provides an excellent illustration of Statius' fondness for recessed panel structure in the overall organization of a poem. Despite the brevity of the composition and the enthusiastic critical attention that has been devoted to it, there is no unanimity among scholars concerning the structure of the poem.[49] In common with many of the poems which we have examined, *Silvae* V. 4 consists of a series of balancing panels which frame a bipartite mythic central section:

I. The poet awake (1-3a)
II. Creatures of nature asleep (3b-6)
III. Statius' sleeplessness: *mythic representation* (7-13)
    A. Pity of Phoebe, Venus, and Aurora (7-10)
    B. Wakefulness of Argus (11-13)
IV. Lover banishes sleep (14-17)
V. Poet's prayer to Sleep (18-19).

J. W. Mackail, who is otherwise impressed by the excellence of the poem, faults only the second section of the mythic panel (11-13), "Were the three lines beginning *Unde ego sufficiam* struck out—and one might almost fancy them to have been inserted later by an unhappy second thought—the remainder of this poem would be as perfect as it is unique." [50] Yet Statius seems to intend to highlight this mythic panel, which Mackail finds so objectionable, by placing it in a central position. By no means an afterthought, the panel with its mythological allusions is the poet's means of conveying to his reader the depth of his suffering. Phoebe, Venus, and Dawn on the one hand, and Argus on the other, represent the two elements of Statius' dilemma: the passage of time (*septima iam rediens Phoebe*, 7; *totidem Oetaeae Paphiaeque recursant / lampades et totiens nostros Tithonia questus / praeterit*, 8-10), and his physical exhaustion and its visible manifestations (*unde ego sufficiam? non si mihi lumina mille*, 11). The evocation of mythological figures in *Silvae* V. 4 serves, as does the participation of the gods in the marriage of Stella and Violentilla in *Silvae* I. 2, to raise an event from everyday life to the level of the universal and permanently significant.

---

[49] For example, Hugo Friedrich, "Über die Silvae des Statius," 52-54, divides the poem into three sections:

1-6 natural world—all asleep but the narrator
7-13 more elevated: *mythologically* viewed
14-19 again addressed to sleep.

Cancik, *Untersuchungen*, 28, divides the poem into two main sections with a brief mythic point separating them:

1-11a Statius alone is awake; all else asleep
  11b-13 Argus
14-19 Prayer

[50] J. W. Mackail, *Latin Literature*, New York, 1895, 190.

Several times in this miscellaneous group of poems, Statius abandons recessed panel structure when he wishes to achieve an effect of chatty informality. *Silvae* IV. 4 *Epistula ad Vitorium Marcellum* strives for such an informal appearance, as one might expect in a friendly letter. The bulk of the poem, a collection of miscellaneous salutations and pledges of friendship, exhibits no structure more formal than an alternation of discussions of Statius and his friend Marcellus. After an introduction instructing the letter on how to reach Marcellus (1-11), the poem sets up a contrast between the *vir negotiosus* (*Marcellus*) in the service of the state and the *vir otiosus* (*Statius*) in the service of art:

I. Introduction: Instructions to the letter (1-11)
II. The letter (12-105)
  A. Laying of the scene: Where is Marcellus summering? (12-26)
  B. *Otium* and its uses for the *vir negotiosus* (27-42)
  C. Marcellus as a man of action (43-49a)
  D. Statius and *otium* in the service of poetry (49b-55)
  E. Marcellus, the Emperor, and the state (56-70a)
  F. Marcellus' son Geta (70b-77)
  G. Digression: Vesuvius (78-86)
  H. Statius, poetry, and service to the state (87-100)
  I. Marcellus and Statius: *amicitia* (101-105).

The illusion of informality in this poem is strengthened by the unexpected intrusion of the reference to Vesuvius (78-86). In his edition of the *Silvae*,[51] Phillimore ends the text of the letter at verse 77 and conceives the remainder of the poem as a postlude. Yet at verse 87, Statius once again speaks of himself after a passage devoted to Marcellus' family (70-77), maintaining, after the digression, the regular alternation of discussions of Marcellus and himself. Far from signaling the end of the letter proper, the ἔκφρασις on Vesuvius is an attempt to keep up the epistolary illusion: whatever comes into the mind of the writer is included in the order in which the thoughts occur to him. The passage is not without thematic connection to the remainder of the poem, for it carries on Statius' flattering contrast between his and Marcellus' life styles. Soon one will scarce believe that Vesuvius has laid waste Pompeii. The poet then prays that such desctruction may pass by Marcellus (81-86):

---

[51] Johannes S. Phillimore, *P. Papini Stati Silvae*, 2nd edition, Oxford, 1965,

> mira fides! credetne virum ventura propago,
> cum segetes iterum, cum iam haec deserta virebunt,
> infra urbes populosque premi proavitaque toto
> rura abiisse mari? necdum letale minari
> cessat apex. procul ista tuo sint fata Teate,
> nec Marrucinos agat haec insania montis.

Silvae III. 5 *Ecloga ad Claudiam Uxorem* exhibits the same informality of structure, although perhaps to a lesser degree than does Statius' poetic *epistula*. In the preface to *Silvae* III, Statius calls III. 5 a carefree conversation, *sermo securus* (23), and it therefore comes as no surprise that the overall structure of the poem is somewhat loose:

I. Introduction (1-22a)
  A. Why are you sad, Claudia? (1-2)
  B. The character of Claudia (3-10): *fides*
    1. Possible cause for unhappiness rejected (3-4a)
    2. Character of Claudia (4b-6a)
    3. Journey of Ulysses (6b-10)
  A. Why are you sad, Claudia? (11)
  B. The character of Claudia (12-22a): *Naples*
    1. Possible cause for unhappiness accepted (12-13)
    2. Character of Claudia (14-18a)
    3. Journey of Ulysses (18b-22a)

II. Statius and Claudia (22b-112)
  A. *Fides* of Statius (22b-28a)
  B. Claudia and her *fides* (28b-69a)
    1. *Fides* toward Statius (28b-42a)
    2. *Fides* toward former husband (50-59)
    3. *Fides* toward her daughter (60-69a)
  C. Naples (69b-105)
  A. *Fides* of Statius (106-112).

The abandonment of recessed panel structure in *Silvae* III. 5 allows Statius to make considerable use of his technique of unfolding and expanding material presented early in the poem. The long second division of the *ecloga* (22b-112) is a greatly expanded treatment of two themes broached in the introduction: the *fides* which exists between Claudia and Statius, and the glories of Naples. Statius cannot understand his wife's reluctance to retire with him to his beloved Naples, for he is certain that lack of loyalty is not the reason (3-6a):

> non metuo ne laesa fides aut pectore in isto
> alter amor; nullis in te datur ire sagittis
> (audiat infesto licet hoc Rhamnusia vultu),
> non datur.

Verses 22b-69 are a detailed exposition of all facets of Claudia's *fides*. This leads smoothly to the poet's *laudes Neapolis* (69b-105) by reopening the question of finding a suitable husband for his wife's daughter by her first husband. From his praise of Claudia's *fides* as a mother, Statius passes to a consideration of the fact that her daughter's talents will draw numerous suitors, for Rome is not the sole source of eligible bachelors (69b-71):

> nec tantum Roma iugalis
> conciliare toros festasque accendere taedas
> fertilis: et nostra generi tellure dabuntur.

The remainder of the poem praises the charms of Naples and its surroundings. The section is tripartite and details the geographical location of the city (72-80), the delights of Naples itself (81-94), and the beauties around Naples. In the introduction to the poem, Statius had wondered at his wife's reluctance to leave Rome since she, as he, prefers the quiet which cannot be enjoyed at Rome (14-18a):

> cur hoc triste tibi? certe lascivia corde
> nulla, nec aut rapidi mulcent te proelia Circi
> aut intrat sensus clamosi turba theatri;
> sed probitas et opaca quies et sordida numquam
> gaudia.

Now, in his expanded treatment of Naples, Statius reiterates his promise of the quiet which can be had at Naples. Statius' stategy is to show his wife that Naples has all the advantages of Rome in terms of architectural beauties and amusements (*templa*, 90; *tecti theatri*, 91; *quinquennia*, 92; *variae oblectamina vitae*, 95), without the noise and bustle of the capital (85-88):

pax secura locis et desidis otia vitae
et numquam turbata quies somnique peracti.
nulla foro rabies aut strictae in iurgia leges:
morum iura viris solum et sine fascibus aequum.

Silvae III. 5 has the character of a well-argued legal case. The introduction sets forth the reasons why Claudia should be eager to join her husband in retirement, while the bulk of the poem expands the arguments of the introduction with illustrative detail. The final seven verses of the poem clinch the arguments. Claudia could not resist, for it was Naples that bore Statius and bound him to his wife over the years. It would be ungrateful of him even to suppose, in view of the *fides* of Claudia which he has set forth at length in 28b-69, that she would be willing to be separated from him (106-112):

sed satis hoc, coniunx, satis est dixisse: creavit
me tibi, me socium longos astrinxit in annos.
nonne haec amborum genetrix altrixque videri
digna? sed ingratus qui plura adnecto tuisque
moribus indubito: venies, carissima coniunx,
praeveniesque etiam; sine me tibi ductor aquarum
Thybris et armiferi sordebunt tecta Quirini.

Statius' most intriguing use of his technique of gradual expansion and development of material introduced earlier occurs in *Silvae* V. 2 *Laudes Crispini Vetti Bolani Fili*. When the poem was composed, Crispinus had already received the military command which forms the subject of the poem, but throughout the composition Statius pretends that the only journey which Crispinus is currently making is a vacation in Etruria. Early in the poem, Statius speculates on how painful it will be when a military command, which will certainly come in time, will separate the two friends for many days (8-11a):

Quid? si militiae iam te, puer inclite, primae
clara rudimenta et castrorum dulce vocaret
auspicium, quanto manarent gaudia fletu
quosve darem amplexus!

Gradually the possibility of a military command in the near future becomes a certainty as Statius' references to it become increasingly explicit and sure. The lad's readiness for such a command is stated already in 13b-14:

sed augustis animus robustior annis
succumbitque oneri, et mentem sua non capit aetas.

As the poem progresses, Statius introduces the numerous qualifications for such a post which the youth has by reason of his family ties (8-60) and his own valor (61-131). At the beginning of his discussion of Crispinus' own qualifications, he makes another reference to a journey which the young man is undertaking. Outwardly Statius seems to refer to the vacation in Etruria, but the wording is sufficiently ambiguous to provide a hint at the journey which Crispinus will soon undertake in the military (61-62a):

> Iamque alio moliris iter nec deside passu
> ire paras.

Following his flattering portrayal of the youth's prowess at horseback riding during mock military maneuvers (111-124), Statius urges Crispinus to give thought to a military career. The pretence of a vacation begins to give way to the reality of a military command in the poet's most extensive treatment of the command (125-131):

> ergo age iam magno (ducis indulgentia pulsat,
> certaque dat votis hilaris vestigia frater),
> surge animo, et fortis castrorum concipe curas.
> monstrabunt acies Mavors Actaeaque virgo,
> flectere Castor equos gyris, quatere arma Quirinus,
> qui tibi iam tenero permisit plaudere collo
> nubigenas clipeos intactaque caedibus aera.

After the hinting and foreshadowing of the earlier sections of the poem, the illusion is broken in the final section (168-180) and Crispinus receives the command to take up the tribunate. Verses 172-173a show that the final lines are meant as a fulfillment of Statius' earlier pronouncements:

> dicebam certe: vatum non irrita currunt
> auguria.

Statius ends the poem in mock surprise and genuine delight at Crispinus' good fortune, and exhorts the youth to go forth eagerly and to learn to merit even greater honors (180b):

> vade alacer maioraque disce mereri!

Our investigation of how Statius structures the individual poems in the *Silvae* by thematic organization has demonstrated that the poet tends to construct pieces in all genres included in the collection in a similar manner employing a remarkably small number of structural devices. Recessed panel structuring, the use of which is widespread in ancient poetry, is the central element in Statius' structural vocabulary. In the manner of the Baroque artist, he frequently combines asymmetry, achieved by building his poems from sections unequal in length, with the symmetry assured by recessed panel structure. At the same time, Statius supplements the physical structure of his poems by his technique of gradually introducing and expanding his thematic material and so placing his themes that the structural units of his poems lead to striking climaxes. The combination of these devices in the *Silvae* produces carefully integrated and varied poetic structures.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE STRUCTURE OF THE BOOKS OF THE *SILVAE*

Our analysis of the individual poems of the *Silvae* has shown that Statius' occasional poems are compositions of great complexity and most careful craftsmanship. Even if we allow ourselves to believe Statius' claim that none of the poems took more than two days to write,[1] we cannot doubt, in view of the intricacy of the poetic structures and the perfect balance frequently exhibited by the poems, that Statius gave considerable thought to the disposition of the elements of each of the *Silvae* before he committed his ideas to writing.

Statius' use of thematic structuring in the grouping of separate poems into books is a matter of relative simplicity compared to the structural complexity of the individual poems. The juxtaposition of poems of like or contrasting theme and the grouping together of a number of poems of related theme are not the only devices which Statius employs in organizing his poems into poetic books. We saw in Chapter III that Statius makes considerable use of two organizational principles the functioning of which is external to the theme of the poems themselves: structuring by meter and by alternation of poem length.[2] Structuring by theme is, however, the chief principle used by Statius in organizing the poems of the *Silvae* into books.

The question of the organization of the books of the *Silvae* by theme has hardly been considered by Statian scholars. Only Cancik has approached the subject, and his discussion of book structuring is limited to brief treatment of the organization of *Silvae* I, II, and V. He does not analyze the structure of Books III and IV because they consists in large degree of the "personal poems" (*persönliche Gedichte*) which do not figure at all in his discussion of the *Silvae*. His study of book structuring in the *Silvae* leads him to conclude that the principles employed in organizing the books of the collection are simple, obvious, and by no means so artful and subtle as those used in putting together the *Eclogues* of Vergil.[3] Although Cancik's observation is correct that the principles used in structuring the books of the *Silvae* are limited, these books are nevertheless composed with considerably more art and variation than he seems to recognize, and the question of the thematic structuring of the collection merits more detailed examination than he has accorded it.

---

[1] Praef. I. 14-15. For a discussion of this claim, see Chapter I, 5-9.

[2] See Chapter III, 56-58.

[3] Cancik, *Untersuchungen*, 22, "Dennoch glaube ich nicht, dass sich an

We saw in Chapter III [4] that Wilhelm Port has isolated a number of thematic devices used in the structuring of Augustan poetic works. He noted the tendency in these works to begin and end books with a programmatic poem setting forth the poet's reasons for composing his poems in the genres included in the collection, and to place poems of lesser thematic importance in positions between the first, middle, and last places in the book. Many of the principles which Port has discussed can be seen at work in the *Silvae*. At the same time, however, Statius has evolved other structural principles, independently of his poetic predecessors. The function of a programmatic opening poem is entirely subsumed in the *Silvae* by the prose prefaces which precede the several books of the collection. These contain both elaborate apologies for poetry written in a rather relaxed style (*stilo remissiore*, Praef. I. 9-10) and numerous assertions that the poems were composed in great haste, as well as expressions of fear that this will be all too obvious to the reader. Nevertheless, the first poem in each book of the *Silvae* may be said to function as a dedication, since Statius places first in each book that poem which is dedicated to the addressee of the book. If, however, the book is to contain a poem or poems addressed to Domitian, the Emperor takes precedence over considerations of friendship, and the recipient of the book must be satisfied with second position. Book IV opens with three Domitianic poems, so that the poem addressed to the recipient of the book, IV. 4 *Epistula ad Vitorium Marcellum*, must take fourth place. *Silvae* I. 6 *Kalendae Decembres* is the only Domitianic poem which is not grouped at the beginning of its book with all other Domitianic poems which appear in that book. The reason why Statius has diverged from his usual practice will be discussed below.[5] The ancient editor of *Silvae* V has observed these principles at work in *Silvae* I-IV, for he has

---

den Silven eine derartige unerschöpfliche Vielfalt von Bezügen wird entdecken lassen, wie sie etwa für Vergils Eklogenbuch zu ahnen ist."

[4] See Chapter III, 51-52.

[5] See Chapter V, 124.

placed the consolatory poem addressed to Abascantus immediately after the letter to Abascantus with which he heads the book.[6]

Apart from Statius' rather mechanical principle of placing first the poem addressed to the recipient of the book unless a Domitianic poem must precede it, the structure of the books of the *Silvae* reveals considerable art and individuality. Statius' artistry is demonstrated in the thematic structuring of *Silvae* I:

I. 1 Domitian
I. 2 Personal poem: *Epithalamium*
I. 3 Descriptive poem: *Villa*
I. 4 Personal poem: *Soteria*
I. 5 Descriptive poem: *Balneum*
I. 6 Domitian

The poet has placed a Domitianic poem first in Book I and first in his collection of occasional poetry because, as he says in an extravagant compliment to Domitian, he wished to begin from Jupiter himself, *sumendum enim 'a Iove principium'* (Praef. I. 17-18). The second poem is devoted to the recipient of the book. *Silvae* I. 2 *Epithalamium in Stellam et Violentillam* and I. 4 *Soteria Rutili Gallici* are thematically related. Like the *epithalamium*, the *soteria* is a personal poem dealing with an important occasion in the life of an individual. In contrast to these, I. 3 *Villa Tiburtina Manili Vopisci* and I. 5 *Balneum Claudi Etrusci* are examples of what Cancik terms *Sachlyrik*, or descriptions of objects, in this case of buildings. The book closes with a second Domitianic poem. The Emperor thus seems to enfold the thematic material presented in Book I. Arruntius Stella, one of the *quindecimviri sacris faciundis* (I. 2. 176), and Rutilius Gallicus, the *praefectus urbis*, were individuals in close contact with Domitian in an official capacity. The placement of Domitianic poems at the beginning and end of *Silvae* I suggests that the Emperor keeps watch over his subjects. The structure of the book reflects in schematic form the character of Domitian, who reads the minds of his people, as Statius says in *Silvae* V. 1 *Epicedion in Priscillam <Abascanti> Uxorem* (79-80):

> qui cuncta suorum
> novit et inspectis ambit latus omne ministris.

The four poems which fall between the Domitianic poems seem to substantiate Port's observation that poems of like thematic content in a book containing a small number of pieces tend to be as widely separated as possible. Because the first and last positions in the book were reserved for the Domitianic poems, the thematically related *Silvae* I. 2 and 4 and 3 and 5 stand as far apart as possible in the remaining four positions in the book. Hubert Cancik has noted the alternation of personal and descriptive poems in the structure of *Silvae* I,[7] but he has not observed the interesting fact that the order of the poems in the book exactly parallels the structural principles so widely used in the organization of individual poems in the *Silvae.* In the structure of *Silvae* I, as, for example, in the structure of the Introduction of *Silvae* I. 4 *Soteria Rutili Gallici,*[8] closely related elements frame an inner panel whose components are arranged in parallel order.

---

[6] On the editorship of *Silvae* V, see Chapter III, 49.

The most noticeable fact concerning *Silvae* II, in marked contrast to Book I, is its extremely personal, un-Domitianic character. It is further noteworthy that only two poems in the book, II. 2 *Villa Surrentina Polli Felicis* and II. 3 *Arbor Atedi Melioris*, are in a strict sense descriptive. The remaining five poems in the book are either formal *consolationes* (II. 1 or 6) or bear strong resemblances to consolations (II. 4, 5, and 7).

Hubert Cancik has devoted some study to the structure of *Silvae* II. He has noted that the total of verses in *Silvae* II. 3-5 (144 verses) is approximately equal to that of a single poem of average length in the *Silvae,* and that Statius intends the three poems to be viewed as a unit since he speaks of them in Praef. II. 16-17 as being epigrammatic in nature, *epigrammatis loco scriptos.*[9] He further agrees that the three poems are united by their subject matter (curiosities of nature), "Nicht nur durch Umfang oder ihren Gegenstand ('Curiosa') gehören also diese Gedichte zusammen, sondern auch durch Motive, Stil und Thematik." [10] He expands his arguments concerning the structure of *Silvae* II in an article [11] in which he argues that the central theme (*Leitthema*) of the book is "Kunst und Natur." He suggests as the structure of the book:

---

[7] Cancik, *Untersuchungen,* 21.

[8] See Chapter IV, 94-95.

[9] Cancik, *Untersuchungen,* 19.

[10] *Ibid.*

[11] Hubert Cancik, "Amphitheater. Zum Problem der 'Gesamtinterpretation' am Beispiel von Statius, Silve II 5: Leo Mansuetus," *AU* 14, 3 (1971), 66-81.

II. 1 *familia*
II. 2 *natura*
II. 3 *natura*
II. 4 *natura*
II. 5 *natura*
II. 6 *natura*
II. 7 birthday poem for the dead poet Lucan.[12]

Cancik's scheme of the structure of *Silvae* II is not enlightening, for it tends to blur the close relationships which exist between the poems of the book. A more faithful representation of the structure of *Silvae* II might be:

II. 1 *Consolatio*
II. 2 Descriptive poem: *Villa*
II. 3 Epigram
II. 4 Epigram
II. 5 Epigram
II. 6 *Consolatio*
II. 7 *Genethliacon.*

Cancik's observation that *Silvae* II. 2 *Villa Surrentina Polli Felicis* is related to II. 3-5 because it shares with them the theme of man-made improvement over nature is not convincing.[13] In reality, II. 2 shares little in common with II. 3-5. II. 4 and 5, as miniature *consolationes*, are thematically closer to II. 1 and 6 than to II. 2. II. 3-5 do indeed form a group, akin in theme and alike in length. Poems II. 1 and 6 are most closely related as formal consolations. Only II. 2 and 7 find no exact thematic parallel in the remainder of the book. Because no poem addressed to the Emperor is included in *Silvae* II, the first position is occupied by the poem dedicated to the addressee of the book, II. 1 *Glaucias Atedi Melioris Delicatus.* It was probably Statius' *reverentia* for Lucan (Praef. II. 26-27) that caused him to place the *genethliacon* last, as a special tribute to an honored poet. If this is so, the formal consolations (II. 1 and 6) are separated as far as possible, in accordance with Port's observation that poems of like content tend to be separated as far as possible in collections containing a small number of pieces. *Silvae* II. 3-5 form a sort of central panel between the formal consolations.

The thematic structure of *Silvae* III exactly parallels the structure most typically used in the organization of individual poems in the collection. Balancing sections of briefer compass arranged chiastically frame a recessed panel of greater length and thematic importance:

---

[12] *Ibid.*, 78.

[13] Cancik, *Untersuchungen*, 20.

III. 1 Naples and its surroundings
III. 2 *Propempticon*
III. 3 *Pietas*
III. 4 *Propempticon*
III. 5 Naples and its surroundings

There appears to be a conscious seeking after *variatio* in the organization of the books of the *Silvae.* Book I, in which there is an even number of poems, cannot be said to have a central poem. *Silvae* II has a central unit consisting of three brief poems of related theme. Book III contains only five poems, fewer than any book of the collection prepared for publication by the poet himself. The longest of the five included in the book, III. 3 *Consolatio ad Claudium Etruscum,* occupies the central position and stands as the keystone of the book as an illustration of a theme dear to Statius, the importance of familial love and loyalty. *Pietas* is central to the system of *Silvae* III, a very personal book, in common with Book II and in contrast to Book I. The second and fourth poems of the book are *propemptica* and occupy the positions nearest the central panel. The final poem of the book, *Ecloga ad Claudiam Uxorem,* may have been placed where it stands to balance III. 1 *Hercules Surrentinus Polli Felicis* as a celebration of the delights of Naples. This suggestion of a thematic connection between III. 1 and III. 5 finds support in the mention of Pollius as owner of a villa at Sorrento in III. 5. 102-103:

> caraque non soli iuga Surrentina Lyaeo,
> (quae meus ante alios habitator Pollius auget).

Silvae IV, like the opening book of the collection, is ushered in by a Domitianic poem, but in Book IV, as if to make up for the personal, unofficial nature of *Silvae* II-III, three Domitianic poems open the book. As is the poet's consistent practice, the poem addressed to the recipient of the book stands as near the beginning of the book as positioning of the Domitianic poems will allow, in this case in fourth place.

In the preface to the fourth book (Praef. IV. 24-25), Statius states that *Silvae* IV contains more things than do the previous books, *plura quam in prioribus.* The larger number of poems contained in Book IV than in the other books of the collection is obviously one aspect of the greater variety which the poet promises. Another important aspect is the metrical experimentation which characterizes *Silvae* IV. We recall that Statius had said that *Silvae* IV. 5

was written in a manner new to him, *non solitis fidibus* (IV. 5. 4), and that in IV. 7, the poet calls upon Pindar to grant him power over a new strain, *novi iura plectri* (IV. 7. 6). We saw in Chapter III that *Silvae* IV differs considerably from the previous books of the collection in its greater variety of meters and in its considerable use of metrical variation as a structural principle.[14]

A third aspect of Statius' claim of greater variety in *Silvae* IV is the larger number of structural principles employed in the organization of the poems in *Silvae* IV than in Books I-III. The lyric poems, *Silvae* IV. 5 and 7, contain long distinct sections dealing with the activities of Statius and of the addressees, but in neither is the ring-composition typical of structuring in the *Silvae* in evidence. IV. 7 is unusual in that the entire first half of the poem contains no hint of the main subject of the poem, the *genethliacon.* Poems IV. 2, 3, and 6 do, however, exhibit the recessed panel structure so common in the *Silvae.*

Also unique in *Silvae* IV is Statius' apparent attempt in the book to achieve some degree of thematic connection from one poem to the next. *Silvae* IV. 1-3 form a self-contained Domitianic cycle ending with a poem in hendecasyllables. *Silvae* IV. 3 *Via Domitiana* is followed by IV. 4 *Epistula ad Vitorium Marcellum,* in which the letter, on its way to Marcellus, is instructed to follow the same stretch of highway as that described in IV. 3 (IV. 4. 1-3). In both IV. 4 and 5 are contrasted *otium* and *negotium* in the service of the state, while IV. 4 and 7 treat the theme of the poet's need to consult his friends for advice in poetic composition. IV. 7 ends with a *genethliacon,* and IV. 8 is also a birthday poem. IV. 3-8 thus form a thematically-linked series. The book ends with a poem in hendecasyllables, IV. 9 *Hendecasyllabi Iocosi ad Plotium Grypum,* which forms a metrical balance to IV. 3 with which the Domitianic series ends.

The unusually large number of poems in *Silvae* IV, the metrical experimentation in the book, the employment of structural devices in the poems not in evidence in *Silvae* I-III, and the attempt, however slight, to join poems of fundamentally unlike theme by thematic links, suggest an advance in Statius' technique of integrating a number of poems into a poetic book. The greater structural sophistication of *Silvae* IV supports the arguments presented in

---

[14] See Chapter III, 56-57.

Chapter III that *Silvae* I-III appeared first as a unit and that *Silvae* IV was published alone.[15] It appears that Statius, with the experience of three books of occasional poems behind him, was groping toward a new conception of a volume of poems organized simultaneously upon several structural principles, in which meter, theme, variation, and likeness all would play a part.

Silvae IV, like the first book of the collection, is filled with poems addressed to the Emperor, although, unlike the first book, all of its Domitianic poems stand at the beginning of the book. All evidence suggests that *Silvae* IV was the last book of Statius' occasional poetry published during the author's lifetime.[16] If this is the case, it would appear that Statius, concluding his *Silvae* with a second book in which the Emperor figured prominently, was seeking to create a balanced poetic whole in which a Domitianic book at the beginning and end of the collection framed a central block of personal poems. As the poet had indicated by his structuring of *Silvae* I, he again shows, by his organization of the entire collection, that Domitian, the guardian of his people, enfolds the world presented in the *Silvae* in a protective and beneficent grasp. The overall thematic structure of *Silvae* I-IV closely parallels the structure typical in the individual poems of the collection. A central panel is framed by beginning and end sections of related theme:

Silvae I: Domitianic
Silvae II: Personal
Silvae III: Personal
Silvae IV: Domitianic.

We saw in Chapter III that the ancient editor of *Silvae* V used alternation of long and short poems as a structural principle in the organization of the book. He did not, however, content himself with mere alternation of the length of poems in organizing the book, but observed Statius' use of thematic structuring as well. In *Silvae* V, poems on death alternate with pieces dealing with the joys and trials of the living. *Silvae* V. 1 *Epicedion in Priscillam <Abascanti> Uxorem* is followed by the joyous congratulations of V. 2 *Laudes Crispini*. This is in turn succeeded by a second funeral poem, V. 3 *Epicedion in Patrem Suum*. The next poem, V. 4 *Somnus*, once again treats of the world of the living, while the book ends with a third funeral lament, V. 5 *Epicedion in Puerum Suum*.

---

[15] See Chapter III, 48-49.

[16] See Chapter III, 48-49.

Within this larger pattern, the editor has created a smaller cycle of poems by playing on the relationship between sleep and death, as the two longer *epicedia* (V. 3 and 5) frame the brief address to Sleep (V. 4).

The simultaneous use of variation of meter, length of poem, and theme has created a multi-layered organizational pattern in the books of the *Silvae*. Statius' deliberate effort to avoid duplication in book structures is remarkable. Equally noteworthy is the fact that whole books of the *Silvae* employ the same structural principles as are used in organizing the individual poems of the collection. The structure of *Silvae* I and II combines chiastic and parallel structures, while *Silvae* III exhibits the recessed panel organization so favored by Statius in the structure of his occasional poems. His conception of the structuring of a poetic book is relatively simple, but, as our analysis indicates, it is carefully thought out. The manner in which Domitianic books frame books of a more personal, less official character demonstrates Statius' determination, seen already in the case of individual poems, to use structure in the books of the *Silvae* to reinforce theme.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

In the opening chapter of this study, we suggested that Statius' own characterization of the *Silvae* as compositions produced in great haste was in large part responsible for the unfavorable opinion which critics of the poet's occasional verse have long expressed. We then demonstrated, by a comparison of the *Silvae* with the prescriptions laid down in ancient treatises on epideictic literature, that the influence of these treatises upon Statius' compositional art has been exaggerated considerably and cannot in itself account for the poetic structures employed in the *Silvae*. In Chapter III, we examined a number of devices used extensively in ancient poetic composition and assessed Statius' use of variation of meter and of poem length in the collection. A number of ways in which the poet has used similar or contrasting themes in structuring poems composed in all genres represented in the work formed the subject of Chapter IV, while the use of theme in the organization of the books of the *Silvae* comprised the subject of Chapter V. It was apparent everywhere in our discussion that the careful and balanced arrangement of small structural units within poems, of whole poems, and of complete poetic books was a major concern of Statius in the composition of his collection of occasional poems. The *Silvae* show themselves to be, not crude improvisations as Statius characterizes them in the prose prefaces to the collection, but compositions of meticulous and painstaking craftsmanship.

The impressive structural symmetry which the *Silvae* display is achieved with remarkably limited resources. Units ranging in length from several verses to the scope of an entire poem employ recessed panel organization in which panels of related or contrasting subject matter frame a central section to which the poet attaches particular thematic importance. Opposing this tendency toward symmetry in the overall structure of the poems in the *Silvae* is a disposition toward inequality in the length of the component parts of the poems. Statius' characteristic manner of developing and expanding his themes by reintroducing them in the course of his poems in new and unexpected contexts reinforces the poet's simultaneous employment of symmetry and asymmetry in his attempt to create carefully integrated and varied poetic structures.

Critics of post-Augustan literature have frequently argued that poets of the period, including Statius, tended to devote inordinate attention to the elaboration of small sections of their compositions, to the detriment of the whole.[1] It is undeniable that the epic poets of the Empire, compelled by the need to move and excite their audiences at public recitations, frequently sacrificed the unity of their compositions to the embellishment of the details. Our study has shown, however, that Statius has devoted as much attention to the balance and unity of the poems of the *Silvae* as he has to the elaboration of their parts, and that the criticism of disunity and lack of proportion cannot fairly be leveled against his occasional poetry. In this respect, the *Silvae* are perhaps more successful and satisfying poetic works than is Statius' *Thebaid*.

Our study has concentrated upon structure in the *Silvae* and upon Statius' use of structure to reinforce the themes of his poems. It has shown that Statius is remarkably successful at integrating theme and structure and at using structure to reinforce theme. Study of the principles which underlie the physical make-up of a poetic collection analyzes only one essentially technical aspect of the poet's art. In order to evaluate the poetic quality of the *Silvae*, a thorough examination of their versification, imagery, metaphors, and of the relation in them of form and content would be necessary. Only then would the critic gain a full understanding of Statius' skill as a maker of occasional verse and be able to pass an informed critical judgement upon the collection. This study is a contribution to the understanding of a previously neglected aspect of Statius' art in the *Silvae*. It has proven that, in the matter of the careful structuring of his works, Statius' artistry cannot be doubted.

---

[1] Expressions of this opinion are numerous. Gilbert Highet, *Juvenal the Satirist: A Study*, Oxford, 1954, 96, finds this tendency characteristic of all of post-Augustan poetry, "The big speeches in Seneca's tragedies, the stentorian apostrophes in Lucan's epic, and other highlights of Silver Age poetry, all suffer from the same fault. Like Juvenal, they all tend to sacrifice the whole to the part, to elaborate an irrelevant point for its own sake, and to prefer a succession of fireworks to a rich sunlike glow." Clarence W. Mendell, *Latin Poetry: The Age of Rhetoric and Satire*, 83-84, writes of Lucan's *Bellum Civile*, "The parts are developed at the expense of the whole." H. E. Butler, *Post-Augustan Poetry*, 207, speaks of the blurriness of the whole epic of Lucan. Recently R. D. Williams, *P. Papini Stati Thebaidos Liber Decimus* (Mnemosyne Supplement, 22), Leiden, 1972, xv, noted this failing in the structure of the *Thebaid* of Statius, "An obvious danger, which Statius did not succeed in avoiding, is that under these circumstances of imitation the poem will lack unity. The structure of the Thebaid is sprawling: Statius has included so much from the material of his source that the plot diverges, digresses, and in the first six books especially seems scarcely to progress at all. This is a large scale demerit of the poem; but in contrast it possesses very high merits in individual passages."

INDICES

A. PASSAGES DISCUSSED

Silvae I 56, 123-125
  Preface 5, 11, 46, 48
  I. 1 17, 35
  I. 2 26, 29-31, 62, 83-87
  I. 3 38, 113
  I. 4 37, 93-97
  I. 5 38, 108-110
  I. 6 38, 108, 110-112

Silvae II 56, 125
  Preface 13, 15, 46
  II. 1 19, 24, 59, 64-65, 69-70
  II. 2 38, 113-114
  II. 3 23, 38, 62
  II. 4 19, 72-74
  II. 5 15, 19, 72-74
  II. 6 19, 24, 64-66, 70
  II. 7 24, 25-26, 34, 44, 63, 75-80

Silvae III 56, 126-127
  Preface 6, 13
  III. 1 38, 62, 100-105
  III. 2 36, 87-91
  III. 3 19, 64-65, 67
  III. 4 34, 37, 44, 62, 91-92
  III. 5 33-34, 117-119

Silvae IV 56-57, 123, 127-129
  Preface 12, 13, 46-47
  IV. 1 40-41, 44, 55-56
  IV. 2 40, 55-56, 114-115
  IV. 3 38, 105-108
  IV. 4 31-33, 116-117
  IV. 5 42
  IV. 6 38, 81, 112-113
  IV. 7 24, 42, 80-82
  IV. 8 24, 80, 82-83
  IV. 9 43

Silvae V 49, 58, 124-125, 129-130
  Preface 49
  V. 1 14, 19, 23, 68, 70-71
  V. 2 42, 119-120
  V. 3 19, 23, 65
  V. 4 115-116
  V. 5 19, 49, 65

B. CONCEPTS

αἴτιον 61-62, 84, 91-92, 95-96, 100-102
Climactic Thought Progression 63, 95
Consolation 19-26, 64-74
Description (ἔκφρασις) 38-40, 98-114
Domitian 2, 92, 105-108, 110-112, 114-115, 123-124, 129
Ecloga 33-34, 117-119
Elegy 30-31, 62
Emperor Cult 2, 47-48, 106-108
Encomium 2, 21, 30, 40-43, 67-68, 99
Epistula 31-33, 116-117
Epithalamium 26-31, 83-87
Eucharisticon 40-42, 114-115
Family 2, 118-119, 127
Friendship 2, 13, 23-24, 31-32, 35-36, 40, 88-89, 103
Genethliacon 24-26, 75-83
Leisure (*otium*) 102-103, 131-114, 116-117
Mannerism 61, 82, 120-121
Meter 51, 56-57, 127-128
Poetry 23, 81-82, 102-103
Propempticon 34-37, 87-92
Recessed Panel Organization 53-54, 61-62
Rhetoric 6-9, 16-44
Silva 3-9
Soteria 37, 93-97
Structure 1-2, 21-22, 25-26, 27-29, 35-37, 44, 45-130, 131-132
Unfolding Technique 63-64, 79-80, 89-90, 119-120